

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
VOLUME XXX
UNIV. OF MICH.

NOV 2 1936
NUMBER 4

October 1936

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY of CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK
WERNER JAEGER
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

CHARLES HENRY BEESON, *Managing Editor*
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
JAKOB A. O. LARSEN
RICHARD P. McKEON

HENRY W. PRESCOTT
GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CAMPBELL BONNER, *University of Michigan*
GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN, *University of California*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WALLACE M. LINDESAY, *University of St. Andrews*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*
ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
KENNETH SCOTT, *Western Reserve University*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXXI

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1936

No. 4

La question de Troie: Homère contre Hissarlik	Charles Vellay	289
The <i>Vera Historia</i> of the Palatine <i>Ficus Ruminalis</i>	G. D. Hadzsits	305
Philosophical Aspects of Early Roman Drama	P. R. Coleman-Norton	320
Imprisonment as a Penalty in Ancient Athens	Irving Barkan	338
Notes and Discussions		342
JAKOB A. O. LARSEN: The Treaty of Peace at the Conclusion of the Second Macedonian War.—W. H. ALEXANDER: Some Debated Passages in the Text of Seneca's <i>De clementia</i> .—ANNIE LEIGH BROUGHTON: <i>The Menologia rustica</i> .		
Book Reviews		357
WALTER AREND: <i>Die typischen Scenen bei Homer</i> (Parry).—ENGELBERT DIERUP: <i>Der Humanismus</i> (Dorjahn).—S. A. COOK, F. E. ADCOCK, and M. P. CHARLESWORTH (eds.) and C. T. SELTMAN (prep.): <i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , Vols. X and IV of Plates (Larsen).—R. W. MOORE: <i>Comparative Greek and Latin Syntax</i> (Whatmough).—W. H. S. JONES (trans.): <i>Pausanias, Description of Greece</i> ; and R. E. WYCHERLY: <i>Companion Volume, Containing Illustrations and Index</i> (Johnson).—GÖSTA SKÄLFUND: <i>Le mura di Roma repubblicana, saggio di archeologia</i> (Blake).—CALVIN W. McEWAN: <i>The Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship</i> (Nock).—C. MARCHESI (ed.): <i>Arnobii adversus nationes libri vii</i> (Guinagh).		
Books Received		373
Index to Volume XXXI		375

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. ¶ The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brasil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hayti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). ¶ Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application. For Japan: THE MARUEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., 211 Honan Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October, 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

TAN

y

No. 4

289

305

320

338

342

357

373

375

ality of
er year;
ostage
epublic
Rice,
lands,
de and
untries
ons are
drafts.

Press,
cation.

opies,
cents,
e pub-
stock

CLAS-

s, and

1912.
sed on



CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXI

OCTOBER 1936

Number 4

LA QUESTION DE TROIE: HOMERE CONTRE HISSARLIK

CHARLES VELLAY

TOUTE étude relative à l'emplacement de la Troie homérique doit nécessairement avoir pour base le texte homérique lui-même. Quelle que soit la part que l'on accorde à la fantaisie poétique, il y a, dans les descriptions topographiques de l'*Iliade*, une unité et une concordance qui ne permettent pas de mettre en doute la réalité du tableau. Si, comme il faut bien l'admettre, le témoignage d'Homère à cet égard est un témoignage visuel,¹ et si, comme nous le savons par mille exemples, l'une des qualités essentielles de ce poète est de s'attacher à peindre les lieux avec une exactitude rigoureuse et par des épithètes caractéristiques,² tout le problème du site de Troie se ramène à une simple confrontation des données fournies par l'*Iliade* avec la configuration du terrain. La solution ne devrait donc offrir, en principe, aucune difficulté: s'il y a, dans la vallée inférieure

¹ Non seulement toute l'antiquité classique a considéré les descriptions de l'*Iliade* dans le domaine topographique comme des réalités visuelles, mais elle nous a même transmis une tradition sur le séjour qu'Homère fit en Troade pour y étudier le cadre de son poème:

Κεγχρεαί, πόλις Τρωάδος, ἐν ἣ
διέτριψεν Ὅμηρος μανθάνων τὰ κατὰ
τοὺς Τρώας (Steph. Byz.)

² Sur ce point, qu'il serait trop long de développer ici, voir les témoignages de Strabon, d'Hipparque et d'Eratosthène mentionnés dans mon étude "La question du site de Troie" (dans *L'antiquité classique*, III [1934], 475), et, d'une manière plus générale, les concordances, signalées à maintes reprises par les archéologues, entre les expressions homériques et les découvertes archéologiques (cf. notamment *Revue des études homériques*, III [1933], 65, n. 2).

du Scamandre, un site qui soit en accord avec les détails descriptifs d'Homère, ce site est indubitablement celui que le poète a eu en vue; et, du même point de vue homérique, nous écarterons comme inacceptable tout emplacement qui se trouverait manifestement en désaccord avec le poème.

Malheureusement, la discussion a été obscurcie, dès l'époque de Choiseul-Gouffier et de Lechevalier, par deux erreurs fondamentales: 1° l'identification du Bounarbachi-Sou avec le Scamandre homérique, identification due à une mauvaise interprétation des mots *πηγαὶ Σκαμάνδρου* (*Iliade* xxii. 147-48); 2° le déplacement arbitraire de l'embouchure et du cours du Scamandre, déplacement qui est en contradiction manifeste, non seulement avec le texte homérique, mais aussi avec tous les témoignages de l'antiquité et des temps modernes, qui nous montrent unanimement, dans une suite ininterrompue de 25 siècles, le Scamandre coulant dans le même lit qu'aujourd'hui et se jetant dans la mer au même endroit. Une troisième erreur, due encore à l'interprétation inexacte d'un texte (celui de Strabon xiii. 1. 25), est venue compliquer les choses, en orientant la recherche de la Troie homérique dans la direction de l'Est, sur le même parallèle que la nouvelle Ilion, à une distance de 30 stades, recherche naturellement infructueuse en raison de l'examen incomplet du témoignage utilisé.³ Enfin, la confusion a été portée à son comble par l'intervention de Schliemann et par l'étrange méthode qui présidait à ses travaux; car ici l'erreur sincère disparaît, et l'on se trouve en présence de fautes beaucoup plus graves, constatées et dénoncées par un témoin irrécusable, Frank Calvert, qui, dès 1874, ayant vu Schliemann à l'œuvre, lui reprochait "de supprimer ou de déformer tout ce qui, dans les découvertes d'Hissarlik, mettait ce site en désaccord avec *Iliade*."⁴ De tels procédés, employés comme moyens de persuasion, ont trans-

³ Pour bien comprendre la pensée de Strabon, il ne suffit pas de faire état d'un seul passage; il faut rassembler toutes les explications qu'il fournit. On arrive ainsi à cette conclusion que ce n'est pas rigoureusement à l'Est d'Hissarlik, mais plutôt au Sud-Sud-Est, qu'il faut chercher l'ancienne Troie, car, dit le géographe, cette direction doit s'entendre en remontant de la nouvelle Ilion "vers l'Ida et vers la Dardanie," *πρὸς τὴν Ἰδὴν καὶ τὴν Δαρδανίαν*.

⁴ "To suppress or to pervert every fact brought to light that could not be reconciled with the *Iliad*" (Frank Calvert, "Trojan Antiquities," *Athenaeum* [London], 14 novembre, 1874).

formé le débat en une mesquine querelle d'amour-propre,⁵ et c'est parce que ces procédés ont porté leurs fruits qu'on voit, aujourd'hui encore, certains milieux savants accepter, sans les contrôler, des affirmations qui ne résisteraient pas à l'épreuve de la discussion.

Si l'on veut essayer de résoudre le problème du site de Troie avec l'impartialité nécessaire, il faut délibérément faire table rase de toutes les erreurs, volontaires ou involontaires, qui l'encombrent, renoncer aux hypothèses fantaisistes, aux mutilations de textes, à toute cette exégèse condamnable, et rétablir les choses dans leur simplicité et leur vérité homériques.

Je ne m'attacherai ici qu'à l'un des aspects de la question, celui qui a trait à Hissarlik. Le fait qu'il y a eu là un établissement humain très ancien n'apporte aucune preuve en faveur de son identification avec la Troie homérique. Il est de toute évidence, en effet, que la Troade du deuxième millénaire, comme la Troade plus récente, contenait un assez grand nombre de sites habités, et que, parmi les vestiges que nous retrouvons, l'identification avec la Troie de l'*Iliade* ne peut être établie que par la concordance, plus ou moins complète, avec les indications du poème. Comme celles de Kara-Your, de Halil-Eli, de Hanaï-Tepéh, d'Atchi-Kioï, du Bali-Dagh, d'Eski-Hissarlik, ou de Chigri, les ruines d'Hissarlik sont, par elles-mêmes, des ruines anonymes. Il ne nous est possible de leur donner un nom homérique que si le texte homérique nous y autorise, c'est-à-dire si elles correspondent, au moins dans une large mesure, aux précisions qu'il indique.

Ces précisions, si l'on néglige les détails secondaires, se ramènent

⁵ L'objectivité scientifique ne parait avoir eu aucune place dans les préoccupations de Schliemann. Il annonça la "découverte de Troie" à Hissarlik avant même d'en avoir acquis la conviction, et il ne poursuivit ses fouilles que pour donner un appui à ses affirmations prématurées. "On his return in 1871, he [Schliemann] informed me that, having precipitately announced the discovery of Troy, he would continue his excavations, so as to find some positive evidence, and to save himself from ridicule" (Calvert, *op. cit.*, 7 novembre, 1874). Le même auteur fournit encore (*ibid.*, 14 novembre, 1874) ce témoignage sur les préoccupations personnelles qui, chez Schliemann, prédominaient sur toute autre considération: "Dr. Schliemann has taken occasion to express his surprise that, as proprietor of part of Hissarlik, I should, against my material interest, have published my doubt as to the age and origin of the antiquities discovered by him. He seems unable to understand that in a question of this kind no personal considerations whatsoever ought to have any weight, and that it is simply childish to hope that they can be made to prevail against scientific truth."

à sept caractéristiques essentielles, que je vais essayer d'examiner successivement.

1^o Une des affirmations les plus fréquentes de l'*Iliade*, puis qu'elle ne revient pas moins de neuf fois,⁶ est que la ville de Priam est une ville *grande*, μέγα ἄστυ. Non seulement cette épithète est fréquente, mais il faut noter en outre qu'elle n'est jamais démentie par aucune autre épithète, par aucun autre détail descriptif. Il faut noter encore, pour en saisir l'exacte signification, qu'Homère ne l'emploie que très rarement à l'égard des principales villes du monde grec, et qu'elle ne peut donc en aucune manière être considérée comme une épithète ornementale et sans portée. Si nous nous référons à l'expression de μεγάλη πόλις qu'il applique à Cnossos,⁷ et si, d'autre part, nous considérons que la capitale crétoise était, selon l'estimation d'Arthur Evans, une cité de 100,000 habitants,⁸ nous voyons ce que pouvait être, dans l'esprit du poète, une μεγάλη πόλις ou une μέγα ἄστυ. La similitude nous apparaîtra plus impressionnante encore si nous constatons que la tradition conservée par les scolastes attribuait à la Troie de Priam un périmètre semblable à celui de Cnossos, soit 30 stades, ou 5,550 mètres.⁹ Il ne faut pas oublier non plus, que tous les détails du récit homérique confirment cette évaluation: c'est ainsi, pour n'en citer qu'un seul, que l'armée troyenne tout entière—Troyens et alliés—peut se rassembler dans la ville (κατὰ πτόλιν vii. 477), ce qui n'est concevable que dans une ville vraiment vaste.

Si cette affirmation homérique de la "grandeur" de Troie apparaît comme la première et la plus évidente des caractéristiques de la ville, les ruines d'Hissarlik peuvent-elles être mises en concordance avec elle? Là où nous cherchons la capitale d'un royaume, on nous montre une superficie si restreinte qu'on ne saurait comment y loger la plus humble bourgade. Au lieu des 5,550 mètres du périmètre présumé de la Troie homérique, on veut nous faire accepter une enceinte qui en mesure

⁶ ii. 332, 803; vi. 392; vii. 296; ix. 136, 278; xvi. 448; xvii. 160; xxii. 251.

⁷ *Od.* xix. 178.

⁸ A défaut du grand ouvrage d'Arthur Evans, *The Palace of Minos*, on peut consulter à ce sujet le résumé publié par J. D. S. Pendlebury, *A Handbook to the Palace of Minos at Knossos* (London, 1933), p. 35.

⁹ *Scol. Il.* xxii. 208. Un des scolastes porte même le périmètre de Troie à 60 stades (*ibid.*). Pour celui de Cnossos, cf. Strabon x. 4. 7.

à peine 500. Au lieu des 1,500 ou 2,000 mètres de diamètre qui sont le minimum de ce que nous espérons, on nous offre une ellipse dont le grand axe, mesuré à l'intérieur des murailles, n'a pas plus de 180 mètres, et le petit axe à peine 140; au lieu d'une ville immense, une taupinière dont on fait le tour en quelques minutes;¹⁰ au lieu d'une cité capable de contenir à la fois les Troyens eux-mêmes et les troupes de leurs alliés,¹¹ un hameau lilliputien où il ne serait pas possible de faire vivre à l'aise plus de 300 habitants;¹² enfin, au lieu d'une puissante métropole, aux inépuisables ressources, un village que quelques centaines de soldats auraient pu, de l'aveu même de Frank Calvert, investir, réduire et dévaster en dix jours.¹³ Et où trouverons-nous, dans cet espace étroit, une place pour le palais de Priam, qui, dans la pensée du poète, s'apparente à ces palais minoens ou mycéniens dont nous connaissons tant d'exemples et qui, pour la plupart, dépassent en superficie la butte d'Hissarlik tout entière?

Quand, au début de ses travaux, Schliemann n'avait pas encore pris le parti de dénaturer les textes et les faits, il avouait qu'il fallait trouver, pour rester en accord avec Homère, une ville correspondant à une population de 50,000 habitants.¹⁴ C'est pourquoi, ayant mis au jour, à Hissarlik, un établissement humain d'une extraordinaire exiguité, il voulut tout d'abord n'y voir que le noyau central, la citadelle, de la ville homérique, et s'acharna à la recherche de la ville basse

¹⁰ "Ich mache mich anheischig, um solche Burg in 10 Minuten bequem herumzugehen, und ein gewandter Turner wird zu einem Laufe von solcher Ausdehnung kaum die halbe Zeit benötigen" (Oscar Mey, *Das Schlachtfeld vor Troja*, p. 36). Il s'agit, bien entendu, dans cette évaluation, de la "couche VI" d'Hissarlik, la plus vaste.

¹¹ *Il.* ii. 803; vii. 477.

¹² Cette évaluation de 300 habitants s'obtient en admettant l'existence d'une soixantaine de maisonnettes humaines, littéralement serrées les unes contre les autres, et à 5 personnes par famille. Mais je rappelle que Jebb aboutissait, après déduction des palais et des lieux de culte, au total de 150 habitants (cf. "The Ruins at Hissarlik," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, III [1882], 201).

¹³ Après avoir rappelé que les effectifs de l'armée achéenne, dans Homère, ne sont pas inférieurs à 100,000 hommes, Frank Calvert estime qu'il aurait suffi de la cinquantième partie de cette armée—donc 2,000 hommes—pour réduire Hissarlik en dix jours: "Ein Fünfzigstel dieser Mannen . . . würde mehr als ausgereicht haben, um in zehn Tagen die Schlammsteinmauern zu nehmen und die wenigen Häuser auf Hissarlik zu stürmen" ("Über die asiatische Küste des Hellespont," *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, XII [1880], 35).

¹⁴ "Sa population [de la Troie homérique] doit avoir été au moins de cinquante mille hommes" (*Ithaque, le Péloponnèse, Troie*, p. 157).

qui devait le réconcilier avec l'*Iliade*. Mais quand, après plusieurs années d'investigations stériles, il fallut renoncer à cette dernière espérance, il préféra rejeter le témoignage homérique et se maintenir dans l'invraisemblance. Depuis lors, aucune découverte n'a été faite qui puisse modifier cette contradiction irréductible, et les partisans de Troie-Hissarlik sont contraints de reconnaître eux-mêmes, qu'à Hissarlik il est impossible "d'accorder la tradition poétique avec la disposition des lieux."¹⁵ La discordance complète entre ce site et le texte homérique est donc à la fois évidente par elle-même et unanimement reconnue.

2° J'ai déjà dit ailleurs¹⁶ qu'une autre des caractéristiques essentielles du site qu'Homère a voulu décrire est la disposition de la ville sur trois plans superposés: au bas, en contact avec la plaine, la ville proprement dite; à un étage supérieur, la ville royale, avec ses palais (*ἀκρόπολις*); à un troisième étage, plus élevé que les deux autres, la haute Pergame, avec ses temples (*ἀκροάτη πόλις*). Cette disposition, si peu commune, et qui suffirait, à elle seule, à montrer qu'Homère n'a pas imaginé une ville imprécise, mais qu'il a réellement dépeint un site particulier, ressort, avec la plus parfaite clarté, de deux épisodes: *Iliade* xxiv. 700, où Cassandre monte du palais de son père (*ἀκρόπολις*) à Pergame (*ἀκροάτη πόλις*); et *Odyssée* viii. 504-8, où le cheval de bois, hissé dans l'acropole, doit être encore hissé à une hauteur supérieure pour atteindre l'extrême sommet de la ville.

Pour rester en accord avec Homère, il faut donc que nous trouvions une ville basse montant graduellement vers un premier plateau, puis vers un plateau supérieur, terminé lui-même par des falaises verticales surplombant des rochers sur lesquels se briserait, en tombant, le cheval de bois. Outre cette disposition très spéciale qui situe la partie la plus élevée de la ville, non au centre, mais à l'une de ses extrémités, et qui la dépeint comme dominant, par des parois abruptes, un fond rocheux,¹⁷ il faut que cette double acropole soit assez élevée au-dessus

¹⁵ Dussand, *Les civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la mer Egée* (2^e éd.), p. 144.

¹⁶ Cf. *Revue des études homériques*, I (1931), 51.

¹⁷ Cette idée de précipice vertical est reprise par Virgile: "Turrin in praecipiti stantem. ..." (*Énéide* ii. 460).

de la plaine pour justifier les épithètes d' *αἰπεινή*,¹⁸ d' *αἰπή*,¹⁹ d' *ὄφρυνέσσα*,²⁰ qu'Homère n'attribue qu'à des lieux déjà remarquables par leur altitude. Notons, par exemple, qu'Argos, Tirynthe, Sparte, Cnossos, villes de plaine ou d'une très faible élévation, ne sont jamais qualifiées par lui d' *αἰπεινή*, d' *αἰπή* ou d' *ὄφρυνέσσα*, épithètes qui sont toujours réservées à des villes vraiment élevées, comme Calydon,²¹ dont l'acropole est à une altitude de 169 mètres, et Pédasos,²² qui—si son identification avec Assos est exacte²³—dresse son acropole à 234 mètres ou bien encore à de véritables montagnes.²⁴

Si on confronte Hissarlik avec ce tableau homérique, on est obligé de constater que rien n'y est en concordance avec la description du poème. Hissarlik est une butte écrasée contre la plaine, une ondulation insignifiante, et qui apparaît plus insignifiante encore quand on se la représente dans sa nudité primitive, dépouillée des ruines que les siècles posthomériques y ont accumulées. Avant les premières fouilles de Schliemann, la colline ne s'élevait pas à plus de 30 mètres au-dessus de la plaine environnante.²⁵ L'épaisseur des diverses couches de ruines étant d'environ 20 mètres,²⁶ la colline primitive n'était qu'une protubérance de 10 mètres, que les premières installations humaines ont ensuite quelque peu exhauscée. Comment voir dans un monticule aussi humble la Troie d'Homère, *αἰπεινή*, *αἰπή*, *ὄφρυνέσσα*, haute et escarpée comme une montagne? Loin de dominer les hauteurs voisines, la butte d'Hissarlik se distingue à peine de la plaine qui l'entoure, et, de toutes les collines qui enveloppent la vallée inférieure du Scamandre, elle est, en définitive, la plus basse, c'est-à-dire celle qui est le plus en désaccord avec l'*Iliade*. Où sont les escarpements rocheux dont parle Homère? Où sont ces parois verticales, où le cheval de bois

¹⁸ *Il.* ix. 419, 686; xiii. 773; xv. 215, 257, 558; xvii. 328.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* xiii. 625; *Od.* viii. 516; xi. 533; xiii. 316.

²⁰ *Il.* xxii. 411.

²¹ *Ibid.* xiii. 217; xiv. 116.

²² *Ibid.* vi. 35; xxi. 87.

²³ Sur cette identification cf. J. T. Clarke, *Report on the Investigations at Assos*, pp. 60-61 ("Papers of the Archaeological Institute of America: Classical Series," Vol. I [Boston, 1882]).

²⁴ *Il.* ii. 829; xv. 84; xx. 58; *Od.* iv. 514; vi. 123.

²⁵ Cf. Virchow, dans Schliemann, *Ilios* (éd. française), p. 64.

²⁶ Cf. *ibid.*

pourra être précipité comme dans un abîme? Où est l'acropole, ville royale, demeure de Priam et de ses fils? Où est enfin l'acropole supérieure, la haute Pergame, cette Pergame qu'on imagine, d'après les épithètes homériques, comme dressée sur un sommet semblable à ceux des grandes acropoles mycéniennes? Et si rien de tout cela n'existe, si toute la description homérique contredit et condamne cette butte infime, si tout est en désaccord avec le texte qui est notre guide, comment pourrions-nous y reconnaître la Troie d'Homère?

3° De toutes les indications que nous fournit l'*Iliade* il résulte que la ville est à une distance assez grande du camp des Grecs, et que, soit en raison de cette distance, soit en raison de la configuration du terrain, on ne peut pas voir aisément de la ville ce qui se passe dans le camp ou aux abords du camp. Pour observer l'armée achéenne, au moment où elle sort de ses retranchements, Politès, l'espion troyen, est obligé de s'aventurer si loin de la ville que son extrême agilité peut seule le garantir du risque d'être capturé par l'ennemi (*Il.* ii. 791-94). Quand Priam va réclamer le corps de son fils, il part de Troie avant la nuit, qui ne survient que lorsque le char a déjà atteint le gué du Scamandre (xxiv. 351); après sa conversation avec Achille, il se remet en route en pleine nuit, sur l'intervention d'Hermès (*ibid.* 679-91); néanmoins il n'arrive au gué qu'au moment où l'aurore se lève (*ibid.* 692-95), et par conséquent à la ville qu'au grand jour; détails qui tous font supposer un trajet de plusieurs heures dans chaque sens. Quand le combat se déroule dans le voisinage de la ville, Achille, resté dans le camp, ne peut en suivre des yeux aucun des épisodes, car tout cela est "très loin des vaisseaux," πολλὸν ἀπάνευθε νεῶν (xvii. 403). Cette idée d'éloignement des vaisseaux par rapport à la ville et de la ville par rapport aux vaisseaux revient à maintes reprises dans toute l'*Iliade*,²⁷ et elle ressort encore des mouvements des deux armées, de l'étendue des deux fronts, de la description de la vaste plaine (πεδῖον εὐρύ), et d'autres détails analogues.²⁸

Cette longue distance existe-t-elle entre Hissarlik et l'emplacement du camp achéen tel qu'on peut le calculer par les témoignages com-

²⁷ Cf. v. 791; xi. 803; xiii. 107; xiv. 30; xvi. 45; xvii. 383; xviii. 256; cf. aussi *Odyssée* xiv. 496.

²⁸ Cf. ii. 798-801; vi. 2-4; viii. 521-22; xiv. 145-46, 433-34; xvi. 79, 92, 376; xxi. 1-175; xxiii. 464, 475.

binés des textes anciens et de la topographie de la plaine troyenne? Nous savons, par Pline et Strabon, qu'à leur époque la colline qui porte aujourd'hui le nom d'Hissarlik n'était éloignée de la mer que de 1,500 pas romains²⁹ ou 12 stades,³⁰ chiffres concordants, et représentant, dans les deux cas, un peu plus de 2,200 mètres. Mais, comme le fait remarquer Strabon, cette distance, accrue par le travail constant des alluvions du Scamandre, était, à l'époque de la guerre de Troie, bien inférieure, et vraisemblablement moindre de moitié, ce qui nous amène, en définitive au total probable du 1,100 mètres. Or, de ces 1,100 mètres, il faut encore déduire l'espace occupé par le camp des Grecs. Les évaluations d'Aristarque l'avaient conduit à admettre que ce camp devait s'étendre dans l'intérieur des terres sur une profondeur d'environ 5 stades,³¹ soit près d'un kilomètre. De telle sorte que, si nous tenons compte de tous ces éléments d'appréciation, nous arrivons à constater que la distance séparant le front de l'armée achéenne des murs de Troie n'aurait été, en supposant Troie à Hissarlik, que de quelques dizaines de mètres. Dès lors, tous les épisodes de l'*Iliade* deviennent absurdes, contradictoires et inexplicables: l'exploit de Polixène n'a aucune raison d'être, puisque les murs de la ville sont dans le voisinage immédiat du camp des Grecs et, pour ainsi dire, en contact avec lui; Cassandre n'a aucun motif de monter à Pergame pour épier le retour de son père, puisqu'il lui suffirait de se tenir sur les murailles de la ville pour en être informée mieux encore; on ne comprend pas davantage pourquoi elle annonce aux Troyens une nouvelle qu'ils doivent avoir apprise avant elle-même, étant plus proches encore de la plaine et du camp; le trajet de Priam, de la ville au camp, ce trajet si long qu'il faut faire halte en route pour désaltérer les chevaux et les mules (xxiv. 350), devient tout à fait incompréhensible, puisque la route à parcourir ne dépasse pas une centaine de mètres; les paroles de Polydamas à Hector (xviii. 254-56) pour se plaindre de l'éloignement de la ville et pour lui représenter la nécessité de regagner les remparts prennent le caractère d'un conseil ironique, puisque Troie est à quelques mètres seulement de l'armée; l'ignorance où se trouve Achille des incidents de la bataille (xvii. 401-4) n'est pas moins surprenante, puisque tout cela se passe, pour ainsi dire, sous ses yeux;

²⁹ Pline *Hist. nat.* v. 33.

³⁰ Strabon xiii. 1. 36.

³¹ *Scol. Il.* xxiii. 365; Eustathe *Comm. ad Iliad.* xxiii. 358.

les mouvements des armées, la fuite et la poursuite des combattants, le nombre même de ces combattants, la course de Patrocle, les exploits d'Achille, tout cet ensemble de récits, de tableaux, de batailles qui, selon l'expression d'Homère, remplissent la plaine tout entière,³² n'a plus ni signification, ni vérité, ni vraisemblance; c'est une absurdité constante, et, en dernière analyse, l'évanouissement complet du poème dans un océan de contradictions. Seule, la conception homérique d'une Troie relativement lointaine reste en accord avec les réalités topographiques, qu'il n'est permis ni de méconnaître ni d'altérer.

4° S'il n'y a, entre Hissarlik et l'emplacement du camp achéen, qu'un intervalle insignifiant, une autre impossibilité surgit: celle de trouver, dans ce court espace, la colline de Batiée, dont Homère donne une description minutieuse (ii. 811-15). Il s'agit, comme on sait, d'une colline isolée, dont on peut facilement faire le tour; elle est située en avant de la ville (*προπάρουθι πόλιος*), c'est-à-dire dans la direction du camp ennemi, et c'est là que l'armée troyenne se rassemble pour prendre ses formations de marche et de combat. Où placer Batiée dans les quelques mètres qui nous restent entre la ville et le camp? Une colline est un point de repère topographique assez important pour qu'on s'efforce de le retrouver. Or, dans l'hypothèse de Troie-Hissarlik, non seulement l'espace nous manque pour y loger cette malheureuse colline, mais l'étude topographique la plus attentive nous oblige à convenir qu'il n'y a rien qui puisse correspondre, même imparfaitement, à la description homérique.³³ Point de colline entre Hissarlik

³² Πᾶν πεδίον (II. xvi. 79). En aucun cas cette expression n'est conciliable avec la petite distance qui, même dans l'hypothèse la plus favorable, séparerait du camp grec la position d'Hissarlik, puisque cet intervalle ne constituait qu'une très petite partie de la plaine, laquelle s'étend encore sur plusieurs kilomètres au Sud et à l'Ouest d'Hissarlik.

³³ Aucun des auteurs qui identifient Troie avec Hissarlik n'a résolu, ni même essayé de résoudre, le problème de l'emplacement de Batiée, qui est pourtant un point de repère très caractéristique pour fixer le site de la Troie homérique. Ni Schliemann, ni Leaf, ni Dörpfeld, ne s'y arrêtent. Sur la carte de la plaine de Troie qui est annexée à l'*Ilios* de Schliemann, Batiée est placée, sans justification ni explication d'aucune sorte, à Pacha Tepeh, c'est-à-dire au Sud d'Hissarlik, alors qu'elle devrait de toute évidence être au Nord, dans la direction du camp grec. Dans l'ouvrage de Leaf, *Troy*, le nom de Batiée n'est même pas mentionné; dans son *Strabo on the Troad*, p. 176, le même auteur se borne à avouer que la colline de Batiée est introuvable, et, pour arranger les choses, il fait appel à l'hypothèse complaisante d'une destruction de cette colline par les débordements du Scamandre postérieurement à l'époque de Strabon.

et la plaine, et point de possibilité d'en supposer une, puisque cela équivaldrait à admettre que l'armée troyenne vient faire son rassemblement et ses préparatifs d'organisation et de marche sous les murs du camp grec. Or, s'il n'y a point, entre le camp et la ville, de colline qui puisse jouer le rôle qu'indique Homère et qui corresponde à l'emplacement fixé par lui, c'est indubitablement parce qu'il avait en vue un autre site; de telle sorte que, là encore, la contradiction entre le texte de l'épopée et le site d'Hissarlik est à la fois manifeste et insoluble.

5° Il résulte de divers passages de l'*Iliade* que le Scamandre coule entre la ville de Troie et le camp des Grecs. Pour aller de l'un à l'autre de ces deux points on traverse le fleuve, et le gué du Scamandre tient dans le poème une place assez importante pour qu'il soit difficile de contester son existence. Quand les Troyens sont poursuivis par Achille (xxi. 1-21), ils vont s'entasser devant le gué, où ils ne peuvent s'engager tous à la fois, et où ils sont massacrés, tandis qu'une partie d'entre eux s'enfuient en longeant le fleuve pour échapper à leur ennemi. Quand Priam va de Troie au quartier d'Achille, il passe le gué, et, mieux encore, il y fait une halte pour permettre à ses bêtes de s'y abreuver. Cela est si évident que les partisans de Troie-Hissarlik ont toujours considéré comme une objection particulièrement grave le fait qu'en allant d'Hissarlik au rivage on ne rencontre nulle part le Scamandre, et qu'ils se sont attachés à essayer d'écarter par les hypothèses les plus diverses cette difficulté insurmontable. Schliemann s'empessa d'adopter l'erreur de Choiseul-Gouffier et de supposer que le Scamandre avait, à l'époque homérique, un cours différent de celui d'aujourd'hui³⁴; M. W. Dörpfeld, en transportant récemment le camp grec dans la baie de Bésika, sur la mer Egée, trouva dans cette nouvelle hypothèse le moyen de replacer le fleuve entre la ville et le camp et de lui rendre en même temps son cours normal;³⁵ W. Leaf, plus ingénieux encore, supposa qu'on pouvait tout concilier en admettant que les combattants ne traversaient pas le fleuve; et qu'ils côtoyaient

³⁴ Cf. *Troy and Its Remains*, pp. 72-73, et *Ilios* (éd. française), p. 121.

³⁵ Cf. "Das Schiffslager der Griechen vor Troja," *Studien zur vorgeschichtlichen Archäologie Alfred Götz*, pp. 115-21, avec carte à la p. 116.

le gué sans le franchir;³⁶ enfin Miss Stawell essaya de tout mettre en harmonie en laissant le fleuve dans la partie occidentale de la plaine mais avec une dérivation coulant de l'Ouest à l'Est devant le front achéen, ce qui eût expliqué le passage du gué sans faire violence à la réalité d'aujourd'hui.³⁷ Toutes ces tentatives se sont révélées, en fin de compte, également impuissantes; elles ne sont, et ne peuvent être, que des hypothèses gratuites, qui n'abandonnent à aucun moment leur caractère de créations imaginatives. Aucune base, aucune probabilité, aucun argument, mais seulement le besoin de répondre, par n'importe quel moyen, à des objections inextinguibles. Du point de vue homérique, quatre précisions incontestables dissipent ces hypothèses sans espoir: (a) Si, comme il est dit plus haut, la certitude nous est donnée, par toute une chaîne de témoignages, que, depuis Hérodote jusqu'à nos jours, le Scamandre a toujours coulé dans la partie occidentale de la plaine, le texte homérique, à l'examiner de près, lui donne, lui aussi, le même emplacement, comme sont, du reste, amenés à le reconnaître aujourd'hui M. W. Dörpfeld et Miss Stawell. (b) La traversée du fleuve, à un endroit dit "le gué du Scamandre," est, dans Homère, une chose indiscutable, sur laquelle le texte de l'*Iliade* ne laisse pas plus d'incertitude que sur l'observation précédente. (c) L'hypothèse de Besika, qui avait l'avantage de rendre au Scamandre son lit véritable tout en le laissant entre la ville et le camp, est, en raison de nombreuses autres considérations homériques, rigoureusement inadmissible et doit nécessairement être abandonnée.³⁸ (d) L'hypothèse d'une dérivation du Scamandre longeant les retranchements du camp achéen ne trouve aucun soutien dans l'*Iliade*, qui représente toujours, au contraire, le gué du fleuve comme étant à une assez grande distance du camp, et, selon toute vraisemblance, à peu près à mi-chemin entre le camp et la ville.

³⁶ Cf. *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography*, pp. 35-41, et la carte insérée entre les pp. 44 et 45. Cette carte est un des témoignages les plus curieux de ce que peut donner une étude fantaisiste des textes: le site de la Callicolone, celui de la Troie de Strabon, celui du mur circulaire d'Héraklès, le gué du Scamandre, la route de Troie au camp achéen, tout y rivalise d'inexactitude.

³⁷ Cf. "The Scamander Ford in the *Iliad*," *Proceedings of the Classical Association*, XI (London, 1914), 78-94, avec deux cartes à la p. 79.

³⁸ Sur cette question de Besika, je prends la liberté de renvoyer le lecteur à mon ouvrage *Les nouveaux aspects de la question de Troie* (Paris, 1930), où l'hypothèse de Besika est examinée et réfutée aux pp. 8-46, et où le problème connexe de la signification du mot Hellespont chez Homère et chez les auteurs anciens est également exposé (pp. 46-89).

Or si, de toute évidence, le camp grec doit être maintenu sur son emplacement traditionnel, c'est-à-dire entre Sigée et Rhoetée, et si, d'autre part, le Scamandre coule indubitablement entre la ville et le camp, la conclusion logique qui s'en dégage est que tous les passages de l'*Iliade* qui nous représentent la traversée du fleuve sont autant de condamnations de l'identification d'Hissarlik avec la Troie homérique.

6° Il faut considérer comme un des détails topographiques les plus importants de l'*Iliade* l'emplacement des sources dites "du Scamandre" dans le voisinage immédiat de la ville.³⁹ Ce n'est pas ici le lieu de discuter la question confuse de la température des sources ni celle de la signification exacte du génitif Σκαμάνδρου.⁴⁰ Le seul point que nous ayons à envisager, parce que seul il joue un rôle déterminant dans le débat qui nous occupe, est le fait qu'aux abords de la Troie homérique, et à l'endroit où la ville basse était en contact avec la plaine, il existait des sources abondantes et permanentes, alimentant des bassins qui servaient de lavoirs aux femmes troyennes (xxii. 153-56). Cette indication est d'une importance capitale, à la fois pour sa précision et pour cette autre considération que, dans une plaine comme celle de Troie, elle constitue un point de repère unique, donc, à lui seul, presque décisif. C'est ce qu'avait parfaitement compris Lechevalier, qui estimait que, les sources une fois trouvées, l'ancienne Troie serait trouvée en même temps.

Réussirons-nous à découvrir les sources homériques sur les pentes desséchées de la butte d'Hissarlik? Schliemann s'y est efforcé, mais sans aucun succès, car on ne peut donner le nom de sources aux suintements intermittents et incertains qu'il rencontra. Sur toute la face occidentale de la colline, c'est-à-dire sur toute la face qui regarde la plaine troyenne, il n'y a rien qui ressemble, même de loin, au tableau de l'*Iliade*. Et même si quelque source d'un débit moyen pouvait y être repérée, elle serait encore en opposition complète avec le poème,

³⁹ Il. xxii. 147-48.

⁴⁰ C'est ce génitif qui a fait croire à Lechevalier et à Choiseul-Gouffier que le ruisseau qui sort des sources de Bounarbachi était le Scamandre homérique. Cette question des πηγαι Σκαμάνδρου n'a encore donné lieu à aucune étude vraiment sérieuse, complète et décisive; je me propose de l'entreprendre dans un travail ultérieur qui aura pour titre: *La question de Troie et le témoignage de Strabon*.

n'étant, ni directement ni indirectement, en liaison avec le Scamandre, qui coule à plus de trois kilomètres de là.

7° Si, maintenant, nous passons des détails topographiques aux dispositifs de l'armée troyenne, nous trouverons entre l'*Iliade* et Hisarlik une opposition aussi irréductible que dans les exemples précédents. Nous savons, par les vers 238-40 du chant xii, que l'armée troyenne marche vers l'ennemi en ayant l'Orient à sa droite et l'Occident à sa gauche, donc du Sud au Nord. Nous savons aussi, par les vers 428-31 du chant x, que, lorsqu'elle est déployée en ligne de bataille, l'une de ses ailes s'étend dans la direction de Thymbra, l'autre dans la direction de la mer. En reportant sur le terrain cette double indication, nous pourrions avoir une idée très claire de la topographie homérique et par conséquent de la position de Troie. En mentionnant Thymbra, elle nous offre, en effet, un point de repère qui nous est connu, et qui, par cela même, constitue une base solide de démonstration. L'emplacement de Thymbra, par une heureuse destinée, est l'un de ceux sur lesquels ne s'élève, pour ainsi dire, aucune controverse. Une inscription trouvée à Hanaï-Tepeh, et relative au temple d'Apollon Thymbréen,⁴¹ est venue confirmer les témoignages des textes, notamment celui de Dionysodore,⁴² qui indique avec précision la distance qui sépare du rivage de l'Hellespont le temple d'Apollon Thymbréen, soit 50 stades. Nous avons ainsi la preuve que l'inscription a bien été trouvée *in situ*, et que la localité de Thymbra doit être identifiée, soit avec la colline même d'Hanaï-Tepeh, où une grande nécropole a été repérée, soit plus probablement avec les ruines d'Atchikioï, qui sont à peu de distance de là. Pour trouver la direction générale du front troyen et sa position exacte, nous n'avons donc qu'à suivre une ligne allant de l'Est à l'Ouest, dans la direction de la mer, laquelle mer ne peut être, en raison même de cette orientation, que la mer Egée. L'armée troyenne, dont le centre occupe la plaine, échelonne ses formations, à droite vers Thymbra, à gauche vers la mer, le front tout entier faisant face au nord.

⁴¹ Le Bas et Waddington, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure*, inscription No. 1743d.

⁴² Scol. Euripid. *Rhesos* 508. Je rappelle que Dionysodore ajoute que ce temple d'Apollon Thymbréen, situé à 50 stades de la mer, était dans le voisinage de Troie (πλησίον τῶν πυλῶν τῆς πολέως), ce qui est un témoignage catégorique contre le site d'Hisarlik.

Or, cette disposition, conforme à la fois au texte homérique, à la localisation de Thymbra, et aux témoignages topographiques, est absolument inconciliable avec l'hypothèse de Troie-Hissarlik. Si, en effet, Troie est à Hissarlik, nous aboutissons à cette invraisemblance énorme que l'armée troyenne, qui devrait être établie *au nord* de la ville, pour la couvrir et la défendre, se trouve établie à plus de cinq kilomètres *au sud* de Troie, laquelle, en face du camp grec, est exposée, sans aucune protection, à toutes les attaques de l'armée ennemie. Un coup d'œil jeté sur la carte de la plaine de Troie montre, sans qu'il soit besoin d'aucune explication complémentaire, que, sur ce point comme sur les autres, le texte de l'*Iliade* est en contradiction catégorique avec le site d'Hissarlik.

Si l'on veut bien, d'une part, noter que les objections que j'ai groupées ici ne représentent qu'une partie de l'argumentation homérique contre Hissarlik, et qu'elles pourraient être accrues sensiblement, si l'on faisait entrer en ligne de compte tous les détails du poème;⁴³ si, d'autre part, on note encore que ces discordances entre l'*Iliade* et Hissarlik sont éparses dans tous les chants de l'épopée et ne peuvent par conséquent en aucune manière être résolues par l'explication, toujours plus ou moins tendancieuse, de l'interpolation;⁴⁴ si, enfin, on observe qu'en regard de ces discordances le texte homérique ne met rien dans l'autre plateau de la balance et ne présente nulle part une

⁴³ Pour commenter, ou simplement pour mentionner, tous les passages de l'*Iliade* qui sont en opposition avec le site d'Hissarlik, il aurait fallu étendre démesurément les limites de cet article, puisque ces passages, comme je l'ai dit ailleurs (*Revue des études homériques*, II [1932], 30) sont au nombre d'environ 90. Je me bornerai à signaler brièvement encore: *Il.* xx. 216-217, où Homère rappelle la fondation relativement récente de Troie, ce qui est inconciliable avec la stratification archéologique d'Hissarlik, où les couches primitives remontent au III^e millénaire; xx. 53, où la course d'Arès sur la Callicolone est impossible à concevoir dans l'hypothèse de Troie-Hissarlik; xxi. 1-175, où tous les mouvements d'Achille et tous les épisodes qui le concernent sont en désaccord avec Hissarlik.

⁴⁴ Dans la démonstration que j'ai rassemblée ici, j'ai considéré l'*Iliade* comme un ensemble dont toutes les parties méritent une égale créance et peuvent être invoquées avec la même force dans une discussion de cette nature. Personnellement, je ne crois ni à une *Iliade* à auteurs multiples, ni à un agglomérat de chants populaires, ni à des interpolations importantes et nombreuses. Mais quand bien même cela serait, le témoignage de l'*Iliade* contre Hissarlik s'en trouverait encore renforcé, puis qu'il serait ainsi établi que la condamnation d'Hissarlik n'est pas l'opinion d'un seul poète, mais celle de tous les poètes, d'âges et de lieux divers, qui auraient collaboré à l'*Iliade*, et qu'elle apparaîtrait ainsi mieux encore comme l'écho d'une tradition générale et immuable.

description favorable au site d'Hissarlik;⁴⁵ comment pourrait-on, à moins d'un aveuglement volontaire, refuser de reconnaître la conclusion qui s'en dégage? *L'Iliade* tout entière—sans parler du texte capital de l'*Odyssée* mentionné ci-dessus—est un réquisitoire écrasant contre l'hypothèse de Troie-Hissarlik. L'obstination de Schliemann aussi bien que les travaux de M. W. Dörpfeld, où le problème topographique est laissé à l'écart, ont pu faire oublier cette contradiction fondamentale. Mais il vient toujours une heure où la vérité et la logique reprennent leurs droits. Si on récuse le témoignage d'Homère parce qu'il se présente à nous sous le vêtement éclatant de la poésie, il faut alors avoir le courage de reconnaître que l'évanouissement de ce témoignage primordial entraîne la disparition du problème tout entier, dont les données sont des données homériques, que la controverse devient une agitation dans le néant, et qu'il n'y a plus lieu de chercher Troie ni à Hissarlik ni ailleurs. Mais si, à l'exemple de toute l'antiquité, nous gardons quelque confiance en Homère, si nous accordons à son témoignage une valeur, même relative, si nous admettons que, pour être enveloppée dans la lumière d'une épopée, la réalité historique et topographique n'en conserve pas moins ses éléments essentiels, alors le problème est pour nous irrévocablement résolu, car l'opposition entre les détails de *L'Iliade* et le site d'Hissarlik est trop évidente et trop complète pour qu'on puisse la mettre en doute. Tout se ramène à cette alternative: ou répudier Homère, et avec lui toute l'antiquité, qui a cru en lui; ou renoncer à situer la Troie homérique à Hissarlik.

L'Acropole

MONACO

⁴⁵ Je n'hésite pas à affirmer que, dans toute *L'Iliade*, il n'y a pas un seul passage, un seul tableau, une seule expression, une seule épithète, qui soit indiscutablement favorable à Hissarlik. Les partisans de ce site se basent, la plupart du temps, non sur Homère, mais sur l'unique considération de l'existence des ruines; quand ils cherchent des arguments dans *L'Iliade*, ces arguments se réduisent à deux: iii. 161 et suiv., où Hélène, du haut des murs de Troie, voit et reconnaît les chefs de l'armée grecque; vii. 381 et suiv., où le héraut Idaios va et vient entre la ville et le camp des Grecs en un temps relativement court. En ce qui concerne le premier de ces deux épisodes, on oublie trop souvent que la scène se passe à un moment où l'armée achéenne, s'avancant à la rencontre des Troyens, a déjà parcouru une grande partie de la plaine et se trouve donc à peu de distance de la ville; de telle sorte que non seulement cet argument n'apporte, en fait, aucun appui à l'hypothèse d'Hissarlik, mais qu'il ne peut même pas servir à déterminer si Troie est proche ou éloignée du camp grec. Quant à l'épisode d'Idaios, on voit, par les détails du récit, que la mission du héraut exige de lui une rapidité exceptionnelle, car les Troyens en attendent impatiemment le résultat; mais, même si ce texte pouvait être invoqué en faveur d'un site relativement proche du camp grec, il n'aurait encore aucune valeur spécifique pour Hissarlik, puisqu'il pourrait jouer également en faveur de n'importe quel autre point de la plaine troyenne situé dans les limites qu'il semble indiquer.

THE VERA HISTORIA OF THE PALATINE
FICUS RUMINALIS

G. D. HADZSITS

IT MAY not be possible to establish with absolute certainty the view I hold that the famous fig tree of the Palatine had, in time, three names: (1) *Ruminalis*, (2) *Romularis*, (3) *Ruminalis* again, or possible to establish with equal certainty the reasons for those names. But a strong case can, I think, be made for the view, and this hypothesis clears away many errors of interpretation of which ancient commentators have been guilty and to which later students have fallen heir.¹

It may be well to start with the following statement of Varro's, which gives us a clear-cut expression of his belief that a fig tree was anciently planted by shepherds hard by the shrine of Rumina. He unquestionably believed that fig culture was very ancient and that the cult of Rumina was a cult of the earliest life on the Palatine Hill. His only possible doubt is just why a fig tree was planted at that point. But the planting of a fig tree near the shrine of the milk-goddess was a natural-enough procedure, because the sap of the tree was a sufficient reminder of milk² and the uses to which the "milk" of the fig tree was put. Varro's words may or may not refer to the *ficus Ruminalis*. If he had added the word *illam*, the reference would be clear enough even for us, and the use of the word *Ruminalem* would have removed all doubt on our part. In view of the fame of the *ficus Ruminalis*, Varro's phrase was, perhaps, quite sufficient for his contemporaries. No one, for example, anciently missed the full meaning of *Multa viri virtus animo . . . recursat*. I take it as almost a matter of course that Varro is speaking of this very tree, to which he refers elsewhere as the *ficus Ruminalis*.³ Of course this is not proof. Even if he is not referring to

¹ Many of the passages cited are difficult, and it is no wonder that they have caused trouble.

² Pliny, too, reminds us of the milky sap of the fig tree (*NH* xv. 18. 19. 68; 19. 21. 80-82; xvi. 38. 72. 181; xxiii. 7. 63. 117 and 124, 126); cf., too, Col. *De re rust.* v. 11. 7.

³ See n. 28.

the *figus Ruminalis*, his statement is the most suggestive that we have of what I conceive to have been the probable origin of this famous tree and of its original association; its first name is indicated by these circumstances:⁴

[in] lactis duos congios addunt coagulum magnitudine oleae, ut coeat, quod melius leporinum et haedinum quam agninum. Alii pro coagulo addunt de fici ramo lac et acetum, aspargunt item aliis aliquot rebus, quod Graeci appellant ali[i] *ῥόν*, ali[i] *δάκρυον*. Non negarim, inquam, ideo aput divae Ruminiae sacellum a pastoribus satam ficum. Ibi enim solent sacrificari lacte pro vino et [pro] lactentibus. Mamma[e] enim rumis [sive ruminare], ut ante dicebant: a rumi etiam nunc dicuntur subrumi agni, lactantes a lacte.⁵

We may not be able to prove today that the fig tree was native.⁶ It is believed, however, that Asia (Arabia) was the motherland of the fig tree and that fig culture was carried west very, very anciently. Either the wild fig tree or a cultivated variety grew in Latium and in South Italy at a very early date.⁷ We may not be able to prove that Rumina belonged to the earliest group of Palatine divinities. Wissowa⁸ regarded the use of milk instead of wine a proof of the antiquity of Rumina's cult though not proof that the goddess belonged to the earliest group of Palatine divinities. The Pliny statement is well known:

Romulum lacte, non vino, libasse indicio sunt sacra ab eo instituta, quae hodie custodiunt morem. Numae regis Postumia lex est: "Vino rogi non respargito," quod sanxisse illum propter inopiam rei nemo dubitet [NH xiv. 12. 14. 88].

⁴ Varro's statement commands our attention and respect. It seems so important and suggestive that I wish we knew the sources of his expressed belief and to what extent that belief was shared by his contemporaries. It gives a hint of knowledge of Rumina which we shall find important and, I should say, suggests Roman religious psychology upon which the real importance of the *figus Ruminalis* rests.

⁵ *Res rust.* ii. 11. 4, 5 (Goetz text; Teubner, 1912).

⁶ Pliny, apparently, thought that it was not, i.e., at least the cultivated variety (NH xv. 18. 19. 69).

⁷ Cf., e.g., Gustav Eisen, *The Fig, Its History, Culture, etc.* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Printing Office, 1901), p. 18 *et passim*.

⁸ *Rel. u. Kultus der Römer*² (München: C. H. Beck, 1912), p. 242.

This statement is, probably, fundamentally correct. Pais,⁹ among others, stoutly argues that Rumina was worshiped by the primitive shepherds and that the cult of the Lupercal and of the *ficus Ruminalis* was fundamental and primordial. Anciently the *ficus Ruminalis* was quite universally regarded as a tree of greatest antiquity, which figured in the earliest life of the earliest settlers. The association of the Romulus-Remus legend with this tree proves that. And *Ruminalis* was anciently¹⁰ thought to have been its original name. The incorrect ancient explanations of the term *Ruminalis* leave, as we shall see, only one possible derivation of the word, viz., from Rumina.

Thus this tree appears, originally, to have been Rumina's tree—we cannot establish this positively but, on the other hand, there is not a single valid argument to suggest the contrary. The tree must have become, to a certain extent, a sacred tree if associated with Rumina, whatever the motives for association. Rumina was a goddess of suckling animals, and her name was derived from *rumis* which equals *mamma*. That this tree—first of religious significance, then of legendary fame—was originally called *ficus Ruminalis* (from the goddess) would appear highly probable¹¹ and appears more certain from the origin, name, and character of the second "Ruminal" fig tree in the Comitium.

The well-known but by no means clear statements in Pliny and Tacitus seem to me to prove that the second—almost equally famous—Ruminal fig tree in the Comitium was closely associated in the Roman mind with the first fig tree on the Palatine, that the second tree was in some way thought to be derived from the first tree, that the derivation was, to an extent, beclouded by legends and wonder tales, that the original growth of the second Ruminal tree was believed to

⁹ *Ancient Legends of Roman History*, trans. M. E. Cosenza (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1905), chap. iii, "The Origins of Rome." Hugh Last, in *The Cambridge Ancient History* (1928), VII, chap. xi, 343, maintains that the fig is a certainty in primitive Latium, because of the large part it plays in early legend. J. R. Seeley believed the tree to be very ancient and sacred to Rumina; the Romulus legend was associated with it later (see *Ed. of Livy*,³ Introd., I, 32 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881]): "It seems likely that her fig-tree had originally nothing to do with the legend of Romulus."

¹⁰ Cf. Pliny, Festus, etc. pp. 312-13.

¹¹ Long since accepted as probably true; cf., e.g., Schwegler (n. 45) and Peter (n. 26).

have taken place in the days of Tarquin and his famous augur, Attus Navius.¹² The tree is called *Ruminalis*.¹³ It was certainly thought to be subsequent to the first tree, and, being derived from it, doubtless owed its name to the first tree—which, thus, quite clearly appears to have been called the *Ruminalis* tree toward the close of the regal period and before—howsoever long it was held in honor earlier. The second Ruminal tree was distinctly a sacred tree, and it owed its sacred character, I should say, in part to the fact that it was planted on a spot where lightning bolts had been buried in the ground¹⁴ and in part to its derivation from an earlier real or quasi-sacred tree, the *Ruminalis* tree of the Palatine which was associated with and, perhaps, consecrated to Rumina. The name *Ruminalis*, as the original name of the first tree on the Palatine, seems to me to be indicated by all the circumstances of which we have any knowledge.

Colitur ficus arbor in foro ipso ac comitio, Romae nata, sacra fulguribus ibi conditis magisque ob memoriam eius quae, nutrix Romuli ac Remi, conditores imperii in Lupercali prima protexit, ruminalis appellata, . . . miraculo ex aere iuxta dicato, tamquam in comitium sponte transisset Atto Navio augurante. Nec sine praesagio aliquo arescit rursusque cura sacerdotum seritur.¹⁵

¹² Further references to Tarquin and Navius: Dion. Hal. iii. 71. 5 (Navius-Tarquin story of knife and stone . . . *καὶ ἵνα μνήμης αἰωνίου τυγχάνῃ παρὰ τῶν ἐπιγινομένων εἰκόνα κατασκευάσας αὐτοῦ χαλκῆν ἀνέστησεν ἐν ἀγορᾷ, ἣ καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου κειμένη πλεονόν τῆς ἱερᾶς σκῆψ . . .*).

Liv. i. 36. 5 also refers to the statue of Navius: "Statua Atti capite velato, quo in loco res acta est, in comitio in gradibus ipsis ad laevam curiae fuit; cotem quoque eodem loco sitam fuisse memorant, ut esset ad posteros miraculi eius monumentum."

Fest. *Frag.* p. 169. 25, M. = p. 168, L.: "Navia est uno ligno exculpta, ut navis, quo utuntur alveo in vindemia. Ficus quoque in comitio appellatur Navia ab Atto Navio augurante" (story of the knife and stone follows).

Cic. *De div.* i. 17. 31 ff. also tells the Navius-Tarquin story of the knife and stone: (33) "Cotem autem illam et novaculam defossam in comitio supraque impositum puteal accepimus."

¹³ There is no indication that it was ever called anything else.

¹⁴ The *ficus* (*Ruminalis*) had the virtue of warding off the lightning bolt; cf. Lydus *De mensibus* iii. 52.

¹⁵ Plin. *NH* xv. 18. 77 (Teubner text; Mayhoff, 1909). This passage is in the midst of a long discussion of the fig, its varieties, historical anecdotes, and capriciousness. I am strongly tempted to take the *miraculo . . . dicato* sentence as referring to the transplanting of a slip of the first tree to the Comitium; if it refers to a bronze group at this place, the sentence no less points to the reputed miraculous origin of the second tree. We must be careful not to misinterpret *transisset*; the passage means: "just as if the tree had crossed over from the Palatine to the Comitium and had done so, of its own accord"; of course, the fact is that the *ficus* on the Palatine was still there, at least to

Eodem anno Ruminalem arborem in comitio, quae octingentos et triginta ante annos Remi Romulique infantiam texerat, mortuis ramalibus et arescente trunco deminutam prodigii loco habitum est, donec in novos fetus revivesceret.¹⁶

Konon's statement about the two trees does not help us very much. But he calls the Palatine tree a "wild" fig tree, and he says of it: ἐρινεοῦ, ὃς μέγας ἐκέϊσε ἐπεφύκει. The twins had been deposited at the base of this tree. In the Comitium there stood the second "wild" fig tree: δέικνυται δὲ μαρτυρία τῶν τότε παρὰ Ῥωμαίους ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐρινεὸς ἱερὰ (guarded by a bronze railing or lattice work). The relation between the trees is not clearly defined.¹⁷

The next step, I take it, in the history of the Palatine tree was the association of the Romulus-Remus legend with this tree—viz., that the twins were exposed here and suckled by the she-wolf under this tree. The association of that legend with the Luperical area on the Palatine and with this tree was perhaps inevitable (for many reasons). The "milk" tree was there, near the shrine of Rumina, the goddess of suckling animals; and it provided a perfect setting for the suckling of the babes by the she-wolf. If Rumina had retained her ancient prestige, no confusion about the name of the tree need have arisen. But the goddess faded in importance, and the Romulus-Remus legend gained an increasingly deeper hold on the imagination of the Romans. Few legends have enjoyed a longer life. Thus the Romulus-Remus legend greatly obscured the significance of Rumina to this tree, both as to the origin and as to the name of the tree. Just when the Romulus-Remus and the she-wolf legend began its magnificent career we may not be able to tell. Some elements in the story may antedate the Etruscan period; others came later.¹⁸ But it seems fair to believe that

Livy's day; to translate the phrase "miraculously transferred," transported, or transplanted, as a statement of fact—as appears in English and German frequently—is incorrect (e.g., Platner, *Ancient Rome* [Boston, 1911], pp. 129 and 231; Jordan-Huelsen, *Topogr.* [Berlin, 1907], III, 39).

¹⁶ Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 58 (A.D. 58). (The Pliny and Tacitus passages certainly imply that the Palatine tree was no longer there; Servius is definite.)

¹⁷ *Narr.* 48, in Photios, 141 a 40, 141 b 22 (Bekker, 1824).

¹⁸ It is not my intention to discuss this perplexing problem. As is well known, Schulze argues that Romulus comes from an Etruscan gentile name, *ruma*, *Roma*; that Romulus becomes the eponymous founder, the eponym of the Romilii. This would place the beginnings of the Romulus-Remus legend in the sixth century (Wilhelm

the legend grew gradually and assumed its final, accepted form certainly not before, but rather after, the days of the Tarquins. We know that it was crystallized and fully developed and a recognized part of the Roman tradition in the third century. Q. Fabius Pictor (perhaps) and Ennius¹⁹ (certainly) were familiar with the association of the twins and the she-wolf with this tree.²⁰ That association was definitely and definitively fixed by the sculptured group representing Romulus and Remus suckled by the she-wolf, which was placed near the *ficus Ruminalis*. Livy tells us of the trial of usurers in 296 B.C. which resulted in the confiscation of their property; the funds, thus made available, were used for a variety of purposes, among others for the

Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1904.) Cf., e.g., Eugenio Manni, "Romulus e parens patriae nell'ideologia politica e religiosa romana," *Il mondo classico*, IV (January-April, 1934), pp. 106-28; also the interesting account by Hugh Last, "The Foundation Legends," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, VII (1928), 363-69, chap. xi, vi. (The "whole saga of early Rome" is thought to be based on Greek foundations; these legends, including some Italian elements, were in the process of elaboration from the fifth on into the third century. Romulus is recognized as "nothing more than eponym of the city.") It is, today, widely accepted as true that the vulgar version of the Romulus-Remus legend is the product of a later stage in the city's history (e.g., Ihne, Schwegler, T. Frank, etc.).

¹⁹ Pictor, see Dion. Hal. i. 78, 79 (Q. Fabius Pictor is given as chief source for the accepted Romulus-Remus legend and is said to have represented the bark, in which the twins were placed, as foundering on a rock, not as settling under the tree). But Aurelius Victor (who also used Fabius Pictor) says: "relabente flumine alveum, in quo pueri erant, obhaesisse ad arborem fici" (c. xx. 3), and Plut. *Rom.* iii f., who also honored Fabius Pictor, places the twins by the fig tree (*ἐπίφειδος*, a "wild" fig tree) (cf. n. 33). Cf. H. Peter, *Hist. Rom. Frag.* (Lipsiae: Teubner, 1883); Q. Fabius Pictor, pp. 6 f. Ennius (Vahlen), Lib. i, xlix. 70: . . . "lupus femina feta repente" (Serv. *Aen.* ii. 355 quotes these words of Ennius); Fest. p. 286, M. = 364, L.; Quint. i. 6. 12, "Varro . . . lupum feminam dicit Ennium Pictoremque Fabium secutus; Serv. *Aen.* viii. 630, 631 ("Fecerat et viridi fetam Mavortis in antro Procubuisse lupam, geminos, etc.), says: "Fabius spelunca Martis dixit. Sane totus hic locus Ennianus est."

li. 71: "Fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto"; cf. Charis., *Inst. Gr.*, I, 128 K.: "Varro quoque de scaenicis originibus libro I sub *Ruminali ficu*." Itaque Plinius Secundus recte arborem ita dici ait . . . fici Ennius, *fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto*; Lucilius. . . ."

liii. 73-75: "Indo tuetur ibi lupus femina, conspiciet omnis: Hinc campos celeri passu permensa parumper." 75 "Conjicit in silvam sese; cf. Non., p. 378.18 = Lindsay, II, 603.

²⁰ The regular version: Liv. i. 4. 5; x. 23. 12; Florus i. 1. 3; Varr. *LL* V. 54; Ov. *Fasti* ii. 411-13; Plin. *NH* xv. 77; Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 58; Serv. *Aen.* viii. 90; Plut. *Rom.* IV. 1; Konon *Narr.* 48; Aur. Vict. 20; Pauli-Festus.

making of this sculptured group: *Et ad ficum Ruminalem simulacra infantium conditorum urbis sub uberibus lupae posuerunt.*²¹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus²² also speaks of this bronze group at this site, i.e., near the Lupercal.

The ancient name of the tree could maintain itself with difficulty; Rumina was too obscure—the ancient meaning of the name *Ruminalis*, i.e., Rumina's tree, could not possibly maintain itself against the overwhelming force of this new association. If the tree was not to be called the "lupine" tree—which would seem a possible alternative, though we have no reason to think that the tree ever gained that designation—the name of the "Romulan" tree would seem almost inescapable under ordinary human psychology; and this name it bore. The Romulan tree it became, as is perfectly plain from Livy and Ovid.²³ They are not theorizing but stating what was accepted by them as a fact. Livy and Ovid give variant forms, *Romularis* and *Romula*, but whether one or the other, or some other similar form,²⁴ the meaning is obvious. The tree was known as the Romulan tree, i.e., the tree of the Romulus legend. I should judge that it commonly went by that name for hundreds (for all we know, three or four) of years.

*Ita, velut defuncti regis imperio, in proxima alluvie ubi nunc ficus Ruminalis est—Romularem vocatam ferunt—pueros exponunt.*²⁵

²¹ x. 23. 12 (I take this to be the Palatine tree, as a matter of course); cf. Dion. Hal. i. 79. 8; the group mentioned by Cicero (*In Cat.* iii. 8. 19; *De div.* i. 12. 20; ii. 21. 47) on the Capitoline, and the famous bronze in the Capitoline Museum, today, are not to be identified or confused with the Ogulnian group.

²² i. 79. 8; ἔθα εἰκὼν κείται τοῦ πάθους Λύκαινα παιδίοις ὄνσι τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐπίσχονσα, χαλκῇ ποιήματα παλαιᾶς ἐργασίας. The words, καὶ τέμενός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ πλησίον, which immediately precede this passage, may perhaps, refer to Rumina's shrine. (Dion. Hal. does not mention the *ficus R.*, as we might expect him to do; instead, he speaks of a rock on which the basket of Romulus and Remus foundered [see n. 19]; in iii. 71 he does mention the fig tree of the Comitium; but he does not mention the bronze group of Romulus and Remus and the she-wolf which is thought to have stood there; it is idle to speculate about these points. Vergil does not mention the fig tree of the Palatine—and this is rather surprising.)

²³ See nn. 25 and 26.

²⁴ Cf. Plut. p. 314.

²⁵ Liv. i. 4. 5. Livy implies that there were variant forms, of which *Romularis* is only one. Likewise there were variant terms, such as *Ruminalis* and *Rumina*. But of the fact of change in name there can be no question; the phraseology is as plain as *circo, qui nunc Maximus dicitur* (Liv. i. 35. 8).

arbor erat: remanent vestigia, quaeque vocatur
 Rumina nunc ficus, Romula ficus erat.
 venit ad expositos (mirum!) lupa feta gemellos.²⁶

The most interesting point, here, is not the survival of the tree—which was for long guaranteed by its sentimental, dimly religious, and quasi-historical significance—or the probability that both Livy and Ovid wrongly thought that it had been called *Romularis* from the beginning, but the new name *Ruminalis* which is distinctly attested. The *ficus Ruminalis* it now was, and by that name it commonly went,²⁷ continuing to be called by that very name to the end. Varro, among others, testifies to the use of this name:

Germalum a germanis Romulo et Remo, quod ad ficum ruminalem, et ii ibi inventi, quo aqua hiberna Tiberis eos detulerat in alveolo expositos.²⁸

But why was the name of the tree changed? No ancient author enlightens us! Before venturing to propose my explanation of this step in the history of the tree, I should like to examine explanations of the word *Ruminalis* which we find in "Pauli-Festus" (which means Verrius Flaccus), Pliny, Plutarch, and Servius. We shall find that the name was something of a puzzle even to intelligent minds, that the Romulus-Remus legend absolutely dominates these explanations, and that the explanations are quite misleading.

Festus and Pliny were so powerfully influenced by the Romulus-Remus and the she-wolf tradition and its association with this tree that they endeavored to explain the name *Ruminalis* by means of reference to that association:

Ruminalis dicta est ficus, quod sub ea arbore lupa mammam dederit Remo et Romulo. Mamma autem rumis dicitur, unde et rustici appellant aedos subrimios, qui adhuc sub mammis habentur.²⁹

²⁶ Ovid *Fasti* ii. 411–13. H. Peter (ed. of *Ov. Fasti*⁴ [Leipzig: Teubner, 1907]) is certainly in error in saying, "Nach Ovid's [verkehrter] Ansicht ist *Rumina* aus *Romula* (= *Romulea*) entstanden." Ovid simply says: "*Romula* [formerly], *Rumina* [now]." *Vestigia* certainly suggests that the tree was dying.

²⁷ *Ficus Ruminalis*, the proper and regular designation: Liv. i. 4. 5; x. 23. 12; *Ov. Fasti* ii. 411–13; Varro *LL* v. 8. 54; Plin. *NH* xv. 18. 20. 77; Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 58; Plut. *Rom.* iv. 1 (*Rominalios*); Aet. *R.* 57 (*Rouminalis*); Serv. *Aen.* viii. 90; Sext. Aur. Victor *Origo gentis Rom.* xx. 4; Paul. *Exc.* p. 333, L. (Fest. *Frag.*, p. 332, L., fragmentary).

²⁸ Varro *LL* v. 8. 54. It is just possible that Varro meant to imply that the tree was the "Ruminal" tree at the time of the reputed famous exposure of the twins.

²⁹ Paul. *Exc.*, p. 333 (Lindsay ed. of Sextus Pompeius Festus) = 271.4, M. The corresponding (fragmentary) passage in Festi *Frag.* (270. 21, M.) clearly rests on the quoted

So mysterious was the name *Ruminalis*, so obscure had the goddess Rumina become, that Pliny, also, fell into the gross error of supposing that the tree owed its name, originally, to the assumed fact that the she-wolf had offered her dugs to Romulus and Remus under this tree; that the ancient mind had indulged in this fantastic refinement of thinking and of arguing from *rumis* = *mamma* (of the she-wolf) to the name *Ruminalis* as the name of the tree; that the tree was, from the beginning, the "tree of the famous breasts" of the she-wolf or that the tree was named from the suckling of the twins by the she-wolf. The Romulus-Remus legend so completely filled the Roman mind (if these views are typical), so utterly wiped out memory of Rumina, that Pliny did not hesitate to give this explanation as the true explanation of the name, i.e., of the ancient, original name; and no other explanation was a possibility for him:

Colitur ficus arbor in foro ipso ac comitio . . . magisque ob memoriam eius quae, nutrix Romuli ac Remi, conditores imperii in Lupercali prima protexit, ruminalis appellata, quoniam sub ea inventa est lupa infantibus praebens rumim—ita vocabant mammam.³⁰

But the Romulus-Remus legend was not current at the beginnings of the city life. It is, perhaps, conceivable that the tree might have gained the name *Ruminalis* in some such way as Pliny and Festus suggested, at the later date when the Romulus-Remus legend actually and in fact crystallized, but, on the contrary, we know that the tree came to be known as the Romulan tree because of that association.

The Festus-Pliny explanation (etymologically correct enough)³¹ appears to be the explanation not of the realist or of the historian but of the romanticist and the student of words who had less knowledge of Rumina than Varro had and who were completely misled by the

authority of Varro. Varro might have advanced this view, alongside of the other suggestion in *RR* ii. 11. 4, 5 (cf. n. 5). On the other hand, Festus may have erred in attributing this view to Varro! A second explanation appears, connecting *Ruminalis* with *ruminari* (cf. n. 34).

³⁰ *NH* xv. 18. 20. 77. Of course, I am aware that more than one scholar has taken *ruminalis appellata* with *ficus arbor in foro*; e.g., I. G. Scott, "Early Roman Traditions, etc.," *Mem. of the Amer. Acad. in Rome*, VIII (1929), 52. But I think that is wrong.

³¹ Cf. A. Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*² (Heidelberg: Winter, 1910); cf., too, A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Comment on ruma, rumis, and on rumen, ruma, Dict. Etym., etc.* (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1932).

common assumption that the Romulus-Remus legend belonged to the earliest history of the city. While Pliny and Festus testify to the antiquity³² of the term *Ruminalis* as the original name of the tree, as well as to the fact that this was its current name, their explanation of the term is beside the mark, and shows only that this new interpretation of an ancient name was, doubtless, widely held and that it persisted for long.

Plutarch was quite as much under the domination of the Romulus-Remus legend as were Festus and Pliny, and this is all the more surprising because of his knowledge of Rumina. In fact, the Romulus-Remus and the Rumina ideas both hovered before his mind.

Ἦν δὲ πλησίον ἐρινεός, ὃν Ῥωμινάλιον ἐκάλουν, ἣ διὰ τὸν Ῥωμύλον, ὥς οἱ πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν, ἣ διὰ τὸ τὰ μηρυκώμενα τῶν θρεμμάτων ἐκεῖ διὰ τὴν σκιὰν ἐνδιάζειν, ἣ μάλιστα διὰ τὸν τῶν βρεφῶν θηλασμόν, ὅτι τὴν τε θηλὴν ροῦμαν ὠνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί, καὶ θεὸν τινα τῆς ἐκτροφῆς τῶν νηπίων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δοκοῦσαν ὀνομάζουσι Ῥουμίλιαν, καὶ θίουσιν αὐτῇ νηφάλια, καὶ γάλα τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐπισπένδουσιν.³³

Was *Rominalios* (as he here calls the name of the tree) derived from Romulus, as was commonly, widely, popularly believed? This was a plausible theory for those who believed that the Romulus-Remus association was primary, and it was a correct explanation for the second designation of the tree (whether the form was *Rominalios*, *Romularis*, or *Romula*). Or did the name of the tree come from the fact that ruminating animals spent the noontide under the tree for the sake of the shade? The similarity in sound of *ruminare* to *Ruminalis* made this wrong guess a natural one.³⁴ Or, chiefly, was the word *Ruminalis* due to the suckling of the babes? That the phrase διὰ τὸν τῶν βρεφῶν θηλασμόν refers to Romulus and Remus is quite clear from the statement in the *Aetia Romana*: καὶ Ῥωμινᾶλιν ὀνομασθῆναι λέγουσιν, παρ' ὅσον ἡ λύκαινα τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ τὴν θηλὴν παρέσχεν. This is

³² *Rumis* is recognized by all as archaic.

³³ *Rom.* iv. 1 (a wild fig tree; no clear statement about its actual existence in his day).

³⁴ Sextus Aurelius Victor gives exactly the same interpretation: "Arborem quoque illam Ruminalem dictam, circa quam pueri abiecti erant, quod eius sub umbra pecus acquiescens meridie ruminare sit solitum" (*Incerti auctoris vulgo Sexti Aurelii Victoris Originis gentis Romanae liber C. xx, 3 and 4*). The same false guess appears in the fragmentary text of Festus (p. 332, L.; cf. n. 29) and appears in Servius.

precisely what Festus and Pliny said. But Plutarch knew considerably about Rumina, too. Though he had the choice of deriving *Ruminalis* from Rumina, through *ruma* = *mamma*, or from *ruma* = *mamma* (of the she-wolf), he deliberately chose the latter as the correct explanation of the name (*Ruminalis*) of the tree. Plutarch knew of Rumina as a goddess to whom milk offerings, instead of wine, were made; he speaks of her as still being worshiped in his own day; in the *vita* of Romulus she is called Roumilia, in the *Aet. Rom.*, Roumina.

Ἰδὲ τί τῇ Ῥουμῖνᾳ θύουσαι γάλα κατασπένδουσι τῶν ἱερῶν, οἶνον δ' οὐ προσφέρουσιν; ἢ Ῥοῦμαν Λατῖνοι τὴν θηλὴν καλοῦσι, καὶ Ῥουμινᾶν ὀνομασθῆναι λέγουσιν, παρ' ὅσον ἡ λύκαινα τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ τὴν θηλὴν παρέσχεν· ὥσπερ οὖν ἡμεῖς τὰς τρεφούσας τὰ παιδιά γάλακτι θηλονᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς θηλῆς καλοῦμεν, οὕτως ἡ Ῥουμῖνα θηλῶ τις οὔσα καὶ τιθήνη καὶ κουροτρόφος οὐ προσίεται τὸν ἄκρατον ὡς βλαβερὸν ὄντα τοῖς νηπίοις;³⁵

In spite of what he knew of her, the goddess was a none-too-well-known goddess (of nursing children: *θεὸν τινα*, etc.) and, at most, there is a mere hint at the proper explanation of *Ruminalis*, as the tree of Rumina. Plutarch is not discriminating and shows no real knowledge of the history of this famous tree, which, in fact, he calls by two names: *Rominalis* and *Rouminalis*.

At a later date, when the tree was no longer growing on its ancient site but was, rather, a mere memory, Servius was quite at sea about the etymology or proper explanation of the word *Ruminalis*—whether it was derived from Rumon (an ancient name of the Tiber, as he thought), from Romulus,³⁶ or from milk given to children. The Romulus-Remus legend is back of these explanations; the she-wolf, however, becomes of less importance, as it is not her *ruma* (= *mamma*) that is thought to explain the name *Ruminalis*. Another word—*ruma* = *pars gutturis*—is proposed as an explanation of the ancient name of the ancient tree.

³⁵ *Aet. Rom.* 57 (text readings, Ῥουμινᾶν and ρουμῖναλιν).

³⁶ *Ruminalis* was not derived from Romulus. Festus' statement that some believed that *Romulus* came from *Ruminalis* would seem to be at least a historical possibility, but Festus rejected the suggestion as absurd. All the ancient etymological speculations about *Romulus* seem to be *Spielerei*.

"Romulum quidam (a) fico Ruminali, ali quod lupae ruma nutritus est, appellatum esse ineptissime dixerunt. Quem credibile est a virum magnitudine, item fratrem eius appellatos" (Fest. *Frag.* 266, M. = p. 326, L.).

Rumina, meantime, has quite vanished. Neither Festus, nor Pliny, nor Plutarch, nor Servius grants her the honor that was her due.

Rumon . . . : unde et ficus ruminalis, ad quam eieci sunt Remus et Romulus. Quae fuit ubi nunc est lupercal in circo: hac enim labeatur Tiberis, . . . quamvis ficum ruminalem alii a Romulo velint dictam, quasi Romularem, alii a lacte infantibus dato; nam pars gutturis "ruma" dicitur.³⁷

Thus we have seen that the tree appears to have borne the name *Ruminalis* at first, that it gained the name *Romularis* from the Romulus-Remus, she-wolf legend, and that it was called *Ruminalis*, again, in the first century B.C. and after. Why was the name of the tree changed at that time? Did the ancient name *Ruminalis* persist, in memory, alongside of the later term *Romularis* and, in the first century B.C., for no obvious reason supplant the more realistic term *Romularis*? I think not. Was the name *Ruminalis* actually chosen in the first century B.C., in place of the term *Romularis*, to emphasize one aspect of the relation of the she-wolf legend to this tree? Is it credible that the *rumis* idea, i.e., the thought of the breasts of the she-wolf, should have superseded the Romulan idea, with its clear reference to a national hero? I do not believe that we can entertain that rather preposterous possibility seriously. The explanations of Pliny and others are all explanations of what was conceived to have been the original meaning of an original name, based on the false belief that the Romulus-Remus, she-wolf legend was primary. And so far these explanations are incorrect. The explanations of Pliny and others are quite correct explanations of the term for their own day in so far as they express what the term commonly meant to their own contemporaries: *Ruminalis* suggested *rumis* or *ruma* = *mamma*, and the idea of suckling; it suggested *rumen* or *ruma*, which, in turn, suggested the ideas of chewing and of ruminating; and *Ruminalis* suggested the she-wolf! But neither Pliny nor the others pose as informants that this name was formally attached to the tree, in the first century B.C., with the significance it conveyed to them! One might, indeed, be tempted to challenge such a statement, had it been made. Was the change in name due to a revival of the cult of Rumina? We have no reason whatever for believing that such was the case. The only other alternative, I

³⁷ Serv. Aen. viii. 90 (observe the *quasi Romularem*); cf. *ibid.* 63, on *Rumon* and *ruminans, exedens*; Serv. Ecl. vi. 54 (on *ruminatio, rumen, guttur*).

believe, is to see in the use of the name a revival of an ancient name of the tree, due, I should surmise, to the official agency of a priesthood³⁸ that had some interest in the ancient, obscure Rumina and some record, perhaps, of a tradition of what the original name and meaning of the tree had been. Against the fanciful theorizing of Pliny, Festus, and the rest we have the far more rational hypothesis that the later term *Ruminalis*, which succeeded the term *Romularis*, is to be associated through *rumis*=*mamma* with Rumina.³⁹ The association of trees with divinity was so common and ancient a phenomenon in early Greek and Roman culture that parallels hardly need to be cited.⁴⁰ The tree gained a new title of dignity that justified abandonment of the term *Romularis*. But Rumina was so obscure that the world, at large, apparently did not recognize her name in the name of the tree.

Although Rumina became, in time, an obscure goddess and was later, seemingly, little known—references to her are not frequent, and there are no indications of the vitality of her cult—Varro had a very definite and certain conception of her character and function. Varro remains our chief source of information about Rumina. His knowledge of Roman religion was great, and no one would question the accuracy of his statement:

divae Ruminae . . . ibi enim solent sacrificari lacte pro vino et (pro) lactentibus. Mamma(e) enim rumis (sive ruminare), ut ante dicebant: a rumi etiam nunc dicuntur subrumi agni, lactantes a lacte.

Varro was, in part at least, the source of information for Nonius Marcellus:

Rumam veteres mammam dixerunt. Varro Cato vel de liberis educandis (7): "his Semonibus lacte fit, non vino; Cuninae propter cunas, Ruminae propter rumam, id est prisco vocabulo mammam; a quo subrumi etiam nunc dicuntur agni."⁴¹

³⁸ The *ficus Ruminalis* of the Comitium was a sacred tree; see p. 308.

³⁹ Varro is responsible for this surmise.

⁴⁰ The *ficus Ruminalis* of the Comitium was a sacred tree, as has just been noted. I might mention the sacred cornel tree of the Palatine, the *caprificus* of the Campus Martius, and the sacred oak of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitol.

⁴¹ Non. Marc. 167. 24 f., M. (*De honestis et nove veterum dictis*) = Lindsay ed.; I, 246.

And this passage is also very like another statement of Varro's that discusses the proper care of nurslings, kids, lambs, and pigs:

qui appellantur subrumi, id est sub mamma. Antiquo enim vocabulo mamma rumis, ut opinor. . . .⁴²

Rumina was a goddess who watched over sucklings, a goddess to whom offerings of milk, instead of wine, were made. There was no doubt in Varro's mind about *rumis* (or *ruma*) = *mamma* and that Rumina was derived from *rumis*. Augustine was heavily indebted to Varro for his knowledge of Roman religion in general, and, I have no doubt, he drew his information about Rumina, in particular, from Varro.⁴³ To Augustine, too, *diva Rumina* was a goddess of nurslings (though of children as well as of animals), and he, too, knew the etymology of Rumina, *ruma*, *mamma*. Plutarch⁴⁴ knew something about her, and his Greek is very like Varro's Latin.

Memory of Rumina survived in letters but not sufficiently strong in life to compel belief that the tree, *ficus Ruminalis*, was named from the goddess, both originally and, a second time, in the first century B.C. My theory, therefore, is that the tree was originally named after Rumina and called *Ruminalis*;⁴⁵ that the fig tree in the Comitium was named *Ruminalis* after the Palatine tree, toward the end of the regal period; that the name, *Romularis*, derived from the Romulus-Remus legend, was the second designation; that in Livy's day the tree recovered its original name, in spite of the fact that Rumina was, relatively, so obscure; that the obscurity of Rumina and the prestige of the Romulus-Remus legend were responsible for the confusion and for the false explanations that we find in Pliny, Plutarch, Festus and Paulus, and Servius; that not one of these authors is responsible or

⁴² *Res rust.* ii. 1. 20 (Keil).

⁴³ *De civ. dei* vi. 10 (Varro); iv. 11, 21, 34; vii. 11 (*Ruminus* speculation). Of course, there is no question about the significance of Rumina, as a goddess of nurslings, although Augustine does use the phrase *cum ignobili nescio qua Rumina* (vii. 11). Arnob. *adv. Nat.* iii. 30 and Tertull. *adv. Nat.* ii. 11 may refer to Rumina, but the text is not certain.

⁴⁴ See p. 315.

⁴⁵ A. Schwegler, *Röm. Gesch.*² (Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1867), I, 406-24, believed this tree to be Rumina's tree and that the name *Ruminalis* was derived from Rumina. He does not discuss the history of the name or properly explain the ancient etymological interpretations. His discussion of the meaning and function of Rumina is suggestive but not convincing. The fig tree, Rumina, and the she-wolf idea all seem to him to belong to the earliest life on the Palatine and to suggest fertility.

authoritative on the subject; that the explanation of Pliny and of Festus is plainly the product of academic and romantic uncertainty—which manifests itself even more in the impossible, alternative suggestions of Plutarch and Servius. It is not surprising that the name *Ruminalis* became a problem for these commentators. The truth was probably buried in religious books—some day, perhaps, they will reveal the truth.

Meantime, the name of the famous tree, *Ruminalis*, need not remain a mystery⁴⁶ to us—or the succession of changes in the tree's name. The tree was held in honor, and, to a certain extent, it was revered as sacred for many hundred years. To the Roman mind, undoubtedly, the myth of Romulus and of the she-wolf gave it its chief significance, although, in my view, the tree should have been hallowed through association with *diva Rumina*; it had the possibility of being recognized, through her, as the Roman "tree of life."⁴⁷

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

⁴⁶ Cf., e.g., the discussion in Schroeter's edition of Sext. Aurel. Victor (Lipsiae, 1829), note on *arborem Ruminalem*, C. xx. 4. It well illustrates the speculation of a hundred years ago. The Pauly-Wissowa article makes no effort to explain the history of the name of the tree (*s.v. Feige*, VI, Part II [1909], 2146 f.). The article has many errors; it favors Mommsen's theory (*Röm. Forsch.*, II [1879], 11 ff.), that the fig tree in the Comitium antedated the Palatine tree (but this is purely speculative and rests on no ancient authority or tradition). J. G. Frazer (note on Ov. *Fasti* ii. 411) does not attempt to give the history of the tree; his comment that "in historical times the Ruminal fig-tree stood, not at the Lupercal . . . but in the Forum" is misleading; his commentary on *Ruminus* and *Rumina* (from Augustine) is as purely speculative as that of Augustine; nor do I believe that the *figus Ruminalis* of the Comitium stood where Frazer places it (*Ed. of Ovid, Fasti* [London: Macmillan & Co., 1929], II, 367-69). There were other fig trees, in the Forum (cf. Plin. *NH* xv. 18. 20. 77-78).

⁴⁷ On the fig tree as an ancient symbol of fertility cf. Schwegler, *loc. cit.*; Pais, *loc. cit.*; Frazer, *op. cit.*, II, 343 f.

PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF EARLY ROMAN DRAMA

P. R. COLEMAN-NORTON

DESPITE the efforts of the popularizers of Epicurean philosophy in Rome, Latin may be said to have had no philosophical literature when Cicero began to write on philosophical subjects.¹ From the remains of the dramatic literature of the Roman stage before the Ciceronian age, however, enough evidence emerges that the theater-goers had ample opportunity to acquaint themselves with the tenets of the principal philosophical schools of the Hellenistic period as well as with many of the more important investigations of the earlier eras of Greek speculation. Indeed, so abundant are allusions to philosophers and to their teachings that, notwithstanding the classic mentality of the less cultivated members of the average audience,² it is difficult to escape the conclusion that these recurrent references to philosophical precepts must have been understood³ and may have been treasured in the hearts of their hearers.⁴ And if this conclusion be considered insupportable, with confidence it may be said that, even if much of the philosophizing presented on the stage was "caviar to the general" and fell flat, yet with "the judicious" such philosophizing procured approbation in an age when religion was decadent and when the noblest spirits among the Romans were seeking in Greek philosophy an influence sufficiently strong to stem the tide of demoralization.

¹ Cf. Cicero *Tusc. disp.* iv. 3. 5-7 (a passage of great interest but too long to quote), *Acad.* i. 2. 5, *Fam.* xv. 16. 1.

² Cf. Plautus *Poen.* 11-35; Terence *Heaut.* 35-42, *Hec.* 1-5, 14-15, 28-57, *Phor.* 30-34.

³ In a suggestive study of "Literature and the Common People of Rome" in his *Society and Politics in Ancient Rome* (New York, 1909), F. F. Abbott assumes "with probability that, in adapting . . . plays . . . for presentation to his countrymen, he [Plautus] would expunge from the lines of the Greek playwright those references to classical stories which would be unintelligible to his audience" (p. 178). Independently of Abbott's assumption and attempt "to infer the intellectual interests and capacities of Plautus's audiences by noting what Greek myths appear in his plays," Professor Charles Knapp has collected, under the title "References to Literature in Plautus and Terence" in the *American Journal of Philology*, XL (1919), 231-61, "many passages which deal with literary or quasi-literary matters."

⁴ See, however, Plautus *Rud.* 1249-53.

A survey of the extant plays and of the surviving fragments of the dramas⁵ produced before Cicero devoted himself to the labor of adapting Greek philosophy for Roman readers shows that the great majority of philosophical reflections in them are ethical in character—a circumstance not surprising in view of the traditional Roman attitude toward speculation which did not concern itself with practical affairs. How far this phenomenon is due to the Roman playwrights is no longer debatable. On the one hand, it would be gratuitous to suggest that in general they deliberately inserted philosophical animadversions with a view to the enjoyment or even to the edification of their auditors. And, on the other hand, it is more in accord with the received facts that in general they faithfully reproduced what philosophical statements they found in their Greek originals, of which enough survives to show that philosophical commonplaces in them were not rare.⁶

The purpose of this paper is to support the thesis that through the medium of the stage the Romans had become acquainted with the achievements of Greek philosophers before the formal introduction of Greek philosophy into Rome⁷ and during its gradual growth as a discipline in Roman education.⁸ The more significant testimony,

⁵ Plautus and Terence are quoted from the editions respectively of Lindsay (Oxford, 1903) and of Kauer and Lindsay (Oxford, 1926), while the other dramatists (of whom we have only meager memorials) are cited from Ribbeck's *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*³ (Leipzig, 1897-98). No account has been taken of the work of Publilius Syrus, the late contemporary of Cicero, since it is now difficult to decide how much of the collection of proverbial philosophy extant under his name is from his mimes and how much has been inserted into it by post-Ciceronian writers.

⁶ W. C. Korfmaier has recently summarized in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, LXV (1934), li-lli a study entitled "Philosophical Aspects of Early Roman Tragedy," in which he examined "the remains of Roman tragedy before the Golden Age, with a view to ascertaining their philosophical content" and decided that "the fact that decidedly conflicting philosophical views appear makes it reasonable to suppose that the early tragedians (except occasionally for reasons of ethical instruction) tended to reproduce their Greek originals without great change in philosophical content." A general study of this subject presented rather sketchily has been made also by B. Schlesinger in his dissertation entitled *Über philosophische Einflüsse bei den römischen Dramen-Dichtern der republikanischen Zeit* (Bonn, 1910).

⁷ Cicero claims that this occurred in 155 B.C. at the arrival of the Athenian ambassadors (Diogenes the Stoic, Critolaus the Peripatetic, Carneades the Academic), who delivered public lectures while they were waiting for the senatorial decision of their case (*Tusc. disp.* iv. 3. 5).

⁸ Until and even into Cicero's time there persisted a marked prejudice against the teaching of Greek philosophy in Latin (*Fin.* i. 1. 1). In his boyhood a similar sentiment

drawn from the three general departments into which Greek philosophy was divided, will now be recited.⁹

Rare reference to dialectics, the first main field of Greek philosophy, is made by the dramatists. But, as epistemology is reckoned a part of this division, the line of Ennius' *Alcmaeon* (32)

Sed mihi ne utiquam cor¹⁰ consentit cum oculorum aspectu
finds a place here. This thought is a weapon from the Skeptic armory. In his treatise on the theory of cognition Cicero takes ten citations from the Roman dramatists to illustrate his theme (*Acad.* ii. 27. 88-90).

In physics, the second grand division of Greek philosophy, an attempt was made to ascertain the nature and the laws of the universe, and the fields assigned for this search ranged from astronomy to theology.

Under astronomy, perhaps the most famous quotation from a dramatist is found in a play of Pacuvius called *Chryses* (86-93):

Hoc vide, circum supraque quod complexu continet
Terram
Solisque exortu capessit candorem, occasu nigret,
Id quod nostri caelum memorant, Grai perhibent aethera:
Quidquid est hoc, omnia animat format alit auget creat
Sepelit recipitque in sese omnia, omniumque idem est pater,
Indidemque eadem aeque oriuntur de integro atque eodem occidunt.

Mater terrast: parit haec corpus, animam <autem> aeter adiugat.

This passage shows Stoic influence.¹¹ Other important allusions to astronomical affairs are in Ennius *Iph.* 199-201, *Thy.* 302 and Plautus *Amph.* 271-83, 546-50, *Mer.* 3-7, 873-80, *Rud.* 1-15, 67-71.

When we turn to theology, we find a wealth of evidence in the dramatists, even without counting such commonplaces as "Ita di

had succeeded in suspending the schools of the rhetoricians who used Latin as the language of instruction (cf. Tacitus *Dialogus* xxxv. 1 with Cicero *De oratore* iii. 24. 93-95).

⁹ Limitations of space require that for later papers be reserved discussion of such topics as "Friendship," "Old Age," "Divination," "Fortune," "Fate," etc., which receive philosophical treatment at the hands of the dramatists.

¹⁰ *Cor* is poetic for *animus*.

¹¹ Most Stoics also accepted astrology (cf. Plautus *Miles* 314, *Most.* 563).

faciant," "Di bene vortant," "Ita me di ament," "Di me servant," "Deum virtute," "Di vostram fidem," "Pro deum fidem," "Si dis placet," "Ne di sirint," "Di melius faciant," "Di te perdant," "Male tibi di faciant" with their variants and equivalent expressions¹² as well as abundant adjurations to the gods collectively ("Di immortales") or individually¹³ and the endless exclamations of "hercle," "edepol," "ecastor" with their variations.¹⁴

That the gods are not interested in human affairs—a favorite Epicurean doctrine—is expressed by Ennius in his *Telamo* 269-71:

Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitum,
Sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus:
Nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis, quod nunc abest.

The same sentiment is advanced by Accius *Antig.* 142-43; Plautus *Bacch.* 638a, *Mer.* 4-7, 626-27, *Rud.* 650; Terence *Ad.* 693, *Heaut.* 1038, *Hec.* 772. While the Epicureans extended this tenet to teach that the gods are impotent, as Plautus puts it in his *Epidicus* 610-11:

Si undecim deos praeter sese secum adducat Iuppiter,
Ita non omnes ex cruciatu poterunt eximere Epidicum

(cf. Plautus *Cis.* 51, *Miles* 528-31; Terence *Ad.* 761-62), and therefore encouraged men not to fear the gods, as Terence tells us in his *Hecyra* 772:

Nec pol istae metuont deos neque eas respicere deos opinor

(cf. Plautus *Amph.* 1051-52, *Cas.* 332, *Cur.* 260-67, *Poen.* 1191), yet inconsistently they exhorted their followers to worship the gods, as Plautus phrases it in his *Miles gloriosus* 675:

Et quod in dinis rebus sumas sumpti sapienti lucrost

¹² P. Langen listed these at length in an article "De execrandi formulis Plautinis Terentianisque observatio grammatica" in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, XII (1857), 426-33.

¹³ In *Bacch.* 892-95 Plautus puts seventeen deities into one sentence. In a dissertation *De diis Plautinis Terentianisque* (Königsberg, 1883) T. Hubrich has collected references to all the Olympians, the demigods, and the personified virtues addressed by the actors. Some interesting notes on the attitude of Plautus and Terence toward religion are contained in G. Secknus' dissertation *Untersuchungen zu religiösen Formeln und sonstigen Stellen religiösen Inhalts in den Komödien des Terenz* (Erlangen, 1927).

¹⁴ Professor F. W. Nicolson has given a statistical study of "The Use of *Hercle* (Mehercle), *Edepol* (Pol), *Ecastor* (Mecastor) by Plautus and Terence" in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, IV (1893), 99-104. His grand total of all cases shows 1,548 uses in 26,962 lines and an average of one occurrence in seventeen and one-half verses. A more philosophical, though still statistical, treatment of these ejaculations is given by A. Gagner in his *De hercle mehercle ceterisque id genus particulis praeae poesis Latinae scaenicae* (Greifswald, 1920).

(cf. Plautus *Poen.* 333-34),¹⁵ and to reverence the gods, as Plautus preaches in his *Bacchides* 117-19:

LY. Quid tibi commercist cum dis damnosissimis?

PI. Mali sunt homines qui bonis dicunt male;

Tu dis nec recte dicis: non aequom facis

(cf. Plautus *Miles* 736-37, *Most.* 712-13, *Per.* 26-27, *Poen.* 282, *Pseud.* 265-69).¹⁶ On the other hand, the Academics, actuated by the skepticism which swept into the later Academy, attacked worship as worthless, as Afranius asserts in his *Fratriae* 170-72:

. . . nullam profecto accessi ad aram, quin deos

Supplicii sumptu votis donis precibus plorans obsecrans

Nequiquam defetigarem

(cf. Plautus *Poen.* 449-62). That the gods enjoy an endless existence of perfect happiness—another Epicurean commonplace—is told by Terence in his *Andria* 959-60:

Ego deorum vitam propterea sempiternam esse arbitror

Quod voluptates eorum propriae sunt.

This opinion occurs also in Plautus *Pseud.* 1257-58 and again in Terence *Heaut.* 692-93.

The Stoics supported the omniscience and the omnipotence of the gods. This belief is briefly presented by Plautus in his *Captivi* 313-15:

Est profecto deus, qui quae nos gerimus auditque et videt:

Is, uti tu me hic habueris, proinde illum illic curaverit;

Bene merenti bene profuerit, male merenti par erit

and is likewise found in Plautus *Amph.* 546-50, *Cis.* 484, *Rud.* 9-30; Terence *Eun.* 590, 875, *Phor.* 817; Afranius *Inc. Fab.* 417. Owing to their faith in divine justice, the Stoics denied that the gods make sport of men, as Plautus perverts it in his *Casina* 346-49:

LY. . . . Dis sum fretus, deos sperabimus.

OL. Non ego istuc verbum empsim tittibilicio;

Nam omnes mortales dis sunt freti, sed tamen

Vidi ego dis fretos saepe multos decipi

¹⁵ Important references to the mechanics of worship are collected by A. Kieseberg in his dissertation *Quaestiones Plautinae et Terentianae ad religionem spectantes* (Leipzig, 1884), pp. 2-14. In pp. 20-60 Kieseberg duplicates—but less statistically—the work of Hubrich (see n. 13).

¹⁶ While the *Amphitruo* of Plautus contains some situations calculated to recommend reverence for the gods (e.g., 284-86, 831-34, 841, 1124-27, 1144), the tone of the play as a whole pokes fun at the gods (e.g., 1-152, 271-83). So also in Terence's *Eunuchus* 584-91 are lines which discredit the gods.

(cf. Plautus *Amph.* 997-98, *Cap.* 22, *Mer.* 225-26, *Rud.* 593-94). This trust taught the Stoics submission to the divine decrees, as Plautus professes in his *Aulularia* 88:

Pauper sum; fateor, patior; quod di dant fero

(cf. Plautus *Amph.* 633-36, *Aul.* 742-43, *Bacch.* 816-17, *Cap.* 195-96, *Miles* 725-37, *Rud.* 185-98). Since the Stoics had a genuine religion, they could appeal to the gods for aid, as Plautus pleads in his *Aulularia* 394-96:

Apollo, quaeso, subveni mi atque adiuva,
Confige sagittis fures thesaurarios,
Qui in re tali iam subvenisti antidhac

(cf. Plautus *Cis.* 671, *Mer.* 678-80, *Poen.* 1187-90, *Rud.* 257-58, 694-701; Terence *Hec.* 338), which was granted, as Plautus proclaims in his *Pseudolus* 905-7:

Si umquam quemquam di immortales voluere esse auxilio adiutum,
Tum me et Calidorum servatum volunt esse et lenonem extinctum,
Quom te adiutorem genuerunt mihi tam doctum hominem atque astutum

(cf. Plautus *Cur.* 531, 557, *Per.* 470), in answer to the prayers of the righteous, as Plautus proves in his *Rudens* 1191-94:

Pro di immortales! quis me est fortunatior,
Qui ex improviso filiam inveni meam?
Satin si quoui homini di esse bene factum volunt,
Aliquo illud pacto optingit optatum piis?

(cf. Plautus *Rud.* 26-27, 259-62; Terence *Ad.* 704-5; Afranius *Vop.* 358), and for which thanksgiving was duly made, as Plautus praises in his *Persa* 753-56:

Hostibu' victis, civibu' salvis, re placida, pacibu' perfectis,
Bello extincto, re bene gesta, integro exercitu et praesidiis,
Quom bene nos, Iuppiter, iuvisti, dique alii omnes caelipotentes,
Eas vobis gratias habeo atque ago, quia probe sum ultus meum inimicum

(cf. Plautus *Per.* 251-58, *Trin.* 820-37; Terence *Heaut.* 879-81).

With physics is placed the subject of the soul and its survival. To the composition of the soul scant attention seems to have been directed by the dramatists. However, a modified Stoic view is presented by Pacuvius in his *Chryses* 93:

Mater terrast: parit haec corpus, animam <autem> aeter adiugat.¹⁷

¹⁷ *Aeter* = *aether* and *adiugat* = *adiungit*.

While Cicero's *Tusculanae disputationes* contain numerous citations from the Roman dramatists designed to illuminate the subjects of his second, third, and fourth books (which deal respectively with the endurance of pain, the alleviation of distress, and the remaining disorders of the soul), a survey of their works shows that the most sustained comments on the emotional faculties of the soul are confined to the *cantica* of the comedies¹⁸ and are attended with much moralizing.¹⁹ Most of these passages (which are too long to quote) are susceptible of a philosophical interpretation or at least reflect a philosophical background. The disorders of the soul to be noted in the *cantica* were the subject of much debate in the Hellenistic period, in which the Roman dramatists lived. While the Epicureans emphasized pain as the greatest evil and estimated that the relief of distress is found in diverting attention and while the Peripatetics pronounced pain an evil but protested that neither this evil nor even all evils combined can be compared with the evil of disgrace, the Stoics sought by syllogism to prove to their own satisfaction that pain is not an evil and that all disorder is derived from erroneous judgment, alien from right reason, against nature; and the Academics, sustained by skepticism, announced that, though certitude is impossible, various degrees of probability are within our reach, and thus avoided positive contributions while they attacked the positions of the other schools.

Passages on pain occur principally in the tragic poets, as one would suspect; for the comic poets contribute practically nothing on this point save the situations in which punishments are administered particularly to procurers and slaves and in which women are attacked by the pangs of parturition.²⁰ The Peripatetic doctrine of the utility of pain is advanced by Afranius in an unidentified play (409):

Heu me miserum!—Dum modo doleat aliquid, doleat quid lubet.

¹⁸ In this paper the *canticum* is, strictly speaking, the lyrical monologue or *μονωδία*, marked by meters mixed or irregular to correspond with the emotions expressed.

¹⁹ The following Plautine *cantica* contain moralizing of a general nature: *Amph.* 153-75, 633-53; *Bacch.* 640-70, 1076-86; *Cis.* 22-41; *Men.* 753-74, 966-89; *Most.* 84-156, 858-84; *Pseud.* 1103-23; *Trin.* 223-75; *Truc.* 209-55, 551-74.

²⁰ In his *Cistellaria* 59-103 Plautus paints a poignant picture of a girl heartbroken over her lover compelled to marry another—but there is nothing particularly philosophical about the portrayal except the inevitable comments (intended to be comforting) of her *confidante*, who concludes her consolation by the proverb, "Nihil amori iniuriumst."

In a long passage (*Nip.* 256-67) Pacuvius portrays a scene in which is presented the Stoic precept that the pain of the soul must be chastened by rebuke and reduced to silence, and Plautus proclaims the Stoic sentiment that suicide is suggested in some situations (*Rud.* 664-76) but not in others (*Asin.* 591-745).

Cicero considers (*Tusc. disp.* iii. 11. 24-25; iv. 4. 8-7. 15) that the disorders of the soul fall into the four divisions of delight, lust, distress, and fear, and lists (*ibid.* iv. 7. 16-9. 22) several subdivisions of each disorder. Under delight he puts malice, rapture, ostentation, and the like; under lust he puts anger, rage, hatred, enmity, wrath, greed, longing, and the like; under distress he puts envy, rivalry, jealousy, compassion, anxiety, mourning, sadness, troubling, grief, lamenting, depression, vexation, pining, despondency, and the like; under fear he puts sluggishness, shame, fright, timidity, consternation, pusillanimity, bewilderment, faintheartedness, and the like.²¹ With this classification, which Cicero confesses comes from Stoic sources (*ibid.* iv. 4. 9), it is convenient to connect the chief dramatic references in the *cantica*. While with delight are delineated malice (Plautus *Asin.* 127-52, *Men.* 127-34) and ostentation (Plautus *Bacch.* 925-78), expression of rapture is the essential reason for the extensive roster of examples in this rubric (Plautus *Bacch.* 640-70, *Cap.* 768-80, *Cur.* 96-109, *Per.* 251-71, 753-62, *Pseud.* 574-93, 1246-84, *Rud.* 906-37a, *Stich.* 274-314, *Trin.* 820-42a, 1115-24; Terence *Eun.* 549-56).²² With lust are linked enmity (Plautus *Asin.* 127-52, *Poen.* 817-22; Terence *Ad.* 299-320), wrath (Plautus *Cas.* 148-64), anger (Plautus *Men.* 110-24, 571-601; Terence *Hec.* 198-204), rage (Plautus *Pseud.* 133-229), greed (Plautus *Epid.* 181-200, *Men.* 351-68, *Truc.* 95-111).²³ With distress

²¹ To the Loeb translation of J. E. King (p. 345) I owe these terms, for most of which the Greek originals are named by Diogenes Laertius *De vitis philosophorum* vii. 111-14.

²² Shorter and, therefore, more citable examples from the dramatists of whom we have only fragments are assigned to Accius *Epig.* 296: "Sapimus animo, fruimur anima: sine animo anima est debilis"; Trabea *Inc. Fab.* 6: "Ego voluptatem animi nimiam summum esse errorem arbitror" (obviously a hit at the Epicureans); Atilius *Inc. Fab.* 2: "Per laetitiam liquitur animus"; Auctor incertus, *Inc. Fab.* 37 (= Ribbeck, II, 138, No. 27): "Tanta laetitia auctus sum, ut nil constet" (an un-Stoic view—to say the least). Cf. also Caecilius *Inc. Fab.* 259-64, which Cicero cites only to condemn as Epicurean.

²³ With this section stands the long line of Caecilius *Inc. Fab.* 230: "Nunc enim demum mi animus ardet, nunc meum cor cumulatur ira" (a condition stoutly condemned by the Stoics). Since Cicero derives insanity from lust (*Tusc. disp.* iii. 4. 7-5.

are described anxiety (Plautus *Pseud.* 905-12, *Truc.* 448-81), depression (Plautus *Cis.* 203-30, *Epid.* 526-32; Terence *Ad.* 610-35, *And.* 236-66), despondency (Plautus *Aul.* 713-26, *Cap.* 516-32, *Cis.* 671-94, *Epid.* 81-103, *Rud.* 185-219, 664-76), grief (Plautus *Bacch.* 612-24), compassion (Plautus *Per.* 168-82), vexation (Plautus *Cap.* 81-89, *Per.* 168-82; Terence *Hec.* 281-87), troubling (Plautus *Men.* 753-74, *Mer.* 111-32).²⁴ With fear are found fright (Plautus *Cas.* 621-29), consternation (Plautus *Amph.* 1053-76, *Aul.* 406-14), faintheartedness (Terence *Phor.* 465-70), bewilderment (Plautus *Cas.* 937-59, *Mer.* 335-63; Terence *And.* 625-41, *Eun.* 292-303, *Heaut.* 668-78a, *Hec.* 516-21, *Phor.* 179-90, 728-38), shame (Plautus *Cas.* 875-91).²⁵

The division of philosophical opinion on the problem of the survival of the soul after death is reflected in the plays of the Roman dramatists. Plautus proclaims the Epicurean belief in the mortality of the soul, when he pronounces in his *Bacchides* 1193-95 that there are no future joys:

Non tibi venit in mentem, amabo,
Si dum vivas tibi bene facias tam pol id quidem esse hau perlonginquom,
Neque, si hoc hodie amiseri', post in morte id eventurum esse umquam?

and when he protests in his *Captivi* 741 that there is no future evil:

Post mortem in morte nihil est quod metuam mali.

On the other hand, immortality and joy are joined by Plautus (*Poen.* 275-77), Turpilius (*Het.* 87-88), Terence (*And.* 959-61); while the suffering of the soul in hell is portended by Plautus (*Cap.* 998-99), who also portrays the isles of the blessed and the abode of the wicked (*Trin.* 548-52) and parodies the belief in immortality (*Mer.* 601-6). If belief in ghosts be granted a valid argument in favor of the soul's

11), notice should be paid to the symptoms of madness presented by Plautus in his *Captivi* 547-623 and *Menaechi* 808-965, though these are not *cantica*. Other references to insanity in the fragmentary plays are in Caecilius *Ploc.* 168 and in Afranius *Vop.* 348. It should be remembered that, according to the Stoics, the wise man could not become insane.

²⁴ Under this general group comes the verse from Pacuvius *Dul.* 128: "Non decet animum aegritudine in re crepera confici" (a Stoic sentiment). Cf. also for other opinions on distress Ennius *Inc. Fab.* 360-61; Pacuvius *Herm.* 164, *Inc. Fab.* 422-23; Afranius *Eman.* 77.

²⁵ Here belong the verses from Ennius *Alc.* 20-21: "Multis sum modis circumventus, morbo, exilio atque inopia; | Tum pavor sapientiam omnem mi exanimato expectorat" (a situation scorned by the Stoics).

survival, Plautus has an interesting scene in his *Mostellaria* 431-531, where one of the characters is tricked with a tale of how his house is haunted by spirits.²⁶ The Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis finds expression in an unknown play of Laberius, from whom Tertulian has taken the verse

Hominem fieri ex mulo, colubram ex muliere,

which he says is a *sententia Pythagorae* (*Apologeticus* 48 in *init.*). But perhaps the noblest affirmation in immortality found in a Roman dramatist is assigned to Tyndarus, the brave slave in Plautus' *Captivi*, who speaks thus (682-90):

TY. Dum ne ob male facta peream, parvi existumo.
 Si ego hic peribo, ast ille ut dixit non redit,
 At erit mi hoc factum mortuo memorabile,
 <Me> meum erum captum ex servitute atque hostibus
 Reducem fecisse liberum in patriam ad patrem,
 Meumque potius me caput periculo
 Praeoptavisse quam is periret ponere.
 HE. Facito ergo ut Accherunti clueas gloria.
 TY. Qui per virtutem perii, at non interit.

In ethics, the third general department of Greek philosophy, the evidence appears to point to an almost exclusive emphasis paid to Epicurean doctrines by the dramatists, so far as we can conjecture by the remains, of which about thirty thousand lines belong to comedy (nearly twenty-eight thousand verses of Plautus and Terence) and about two thousand lines belong to tragedy (all fragments).²⁷ As might be expected, the genius of comedy lends itself to Epicureanism more readily than does the spirit of tragedy in which Stoicism would loom more largely, probably, if we had more material by which to judge.

Stoic influence on Ennius may be inferred from his *Hectoris lutra* 160-61:

Melius est virtute ius: nam saepe virtutem mali
 Nanciscuntur: ius atque aecum se a malis spernit procul.

²⁶ Two fragments *ex incertis incertorum fabulis*, but referred to tragedy by Ribbeck (I, 283-84, Nos. 38 and 39), treat of necromancy.

²⁷ The ratio—15:1—of the remains of comedy and of tragedy illustrates Professor J. W. Duff's point that in republican Rome there was "a popular preference for lighter performances. Beyond question, comedy, satire, and epic were more in accord with the national genius" (*A Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age* [New York, 1927], p. 231).

The Stoic devotion to duty finds confirmation in Caecilius *Inc. Fab.* 265:

Homo homini deus est, si suum officium sciat.

Other exhortations to do one's duty appear in Plautus *Stich.* 7-7a, 34-36, 39-46, *Trin.* 697; Terence *Ad.* 501-5, 592-96. The problem of self-mastery is presented from the Stoic point of view by Plautus in his *Trinummus* 305-12:

Qui homo cum animo inde ab ineunte aetate depugnat suo,
Vtrum itane esse mavelit ut eum animus aequom censeat,
An ita potius ut parentes eum esse et cognati velint:
Si animus hominem pepulit, actumst: animo servit, non sibi;
Si ipse animum pepulit, dum vivit victor victorum cluet.
Tu si animum vicisti potius quam animus te, est quod gaudeas.
Nimio satiust ut opust ted ita esse quam ut animo lubet:
Qui animum vineunt quam quos animus semper probiores cluent.

In his *Captivi* 325-28 Plautus praises the Stoic indifference to wealth as a means of happiness:

Non ego omnino lucrum omne esse utile homini existumo:
Seio ego, multos iam lucrum lutulentos homines reddidit;
.....
Odi ego aurum: multa multis saepe suasit perperam.

The Stoic stand that intention, not achievement, constitutes success is parodied by Plautus in his *Trinummus* 439:

Nequam illud verbumst "bene volt" nisi qui bene facit.

The doctrine of moderation in all things, developed principally by the Peripatetics into the formal ethical theory that virtue resides in the mean, is taught by Terence in his *Andria* 58-61:

SR. Horum ille nil egregie praeter cetera
Studebat et tamen omnia haec mediocriter.
Gaudebam. SO. Non inuria; nam id arbitror
Adprime in vita esse utile, ut nequid nimis.

The Peripatetic principle of the comparative value of goods spiritual, corporeal, and external is noticed by Naevius in his *Agitatoria* 9-10:

Ego semper pluris feci
Potioremque habui libertatem multo quam pecuniam

and is pursued in more detail by Plautus in his *Trinummus* 270-75. The Peripatetic position on the effects of the evil of disgrace, to which no other evil is equal, is placed by Plautus in his *Persa* 355-56:

Hominum immortalis est infamia;
Etiam tum vivit quom esse credas mortuam.

Some Peripatetics preached the naturalness and even the necessity of evils, as Naevius notes in *Inc. Fab.* 106:

Pati necesse est multa mortales mala.

The theory that the freedom of the philosopher is forfeited by marriage was taught by Theophrastus, the pupil of Aristotle and after him the next president of the Peripatetics. This opinion is put by Plautus among the observations of Periplectomenus, the middle-aged character in his *Miles gloriosus*, when he launches a lengthy tirade (678-722) against the ways of wives with the words:

Liberæ sunt aedes, liber sum autem ego; me volo vivere.
Nam mihi, deum virtute dicam, propter divitias meas
Licuit uxorem dotatam genere summo ducere;
Sed nolo mi oblatricem in aedis intro mittere.

The Epicurean ethics, proclaiming that pleasure is the only good and that pain is the only evil, established morality as an activity affording pleasure and enlisted most of its energies in the interpretation of this idea.²⁸ Plautus presents the popular preference on this point in his *Captivi* 271-72:

Proximum quod sit bono quodque a malo longissime
Id volo

and in his *Stichus* 119-20 pronounces:

Quanta mea sapientias,
Ex malis multis malum quod minimumst, id minimest malum.

That pleasure is trifling compared with pain is professed by Plautus in his *Amphitruo* 633-34:

Satin parva res est voluptatum in vita atque in ætate agunda
Praequam quod molestum est?

²⁸ Perhaps the most sustained exhibition of Epicurean ethical concepts appears in the first scene of the third act of Plautus' *Miles* 596-812. Here Periplectomenus, in his fifty-fifth year, preaches by word and by example so gross a type of Epicureanism that it may fairly be compared with Cyrenaicism, the forerunner of the former philosophy. His character and the views which he holds have been discussed by F. Ranke in his inaugural dissertation entitled *Periplectomenus* (Marburg, 1900), pp. 65-88.

and in his *Mercator* 359:

Vbi voluptatem aegritudo vincat, quid ibi inest amoeni?

The close connection of pleasure with pain is perceived by Plautus in his *Mercator* 145-46:

Die mihi, an boni quid usquamst quod quisquam uti possiet
Sine malo omni, aut ne laborem capias quom illo uti voles?

In his *Asinaria* 323-24 Plautus permits pain to precede pleasure:

Em istaec virtus est, quando usust qui malum fert fortiter;
Fortiter malum qui patitur, idem post patitur bonum,

but in his *Amphitruo* 635-36 the same poet offers the opposite procedure:

Ita dis est placitum, voluptatem ut maeror comes consequatur;
Quin incommodi plus malique ilico adsit, boni si optigit quid,

to which Terence testifies twice in his *Andria* 720 and 960-61:

Facile hic plus malist quam illic boni.

Nam mi immortalitas

Partast, si nulla aegritudo huic gaudio intercesserit.

The Epicurean emphasis on the negative avoidance of evil instead of the positive attainment of good is encountered in Ennius *Inc. Fab.* 354:

Nimium boni est, cui nil malist.

The Epicurean doctrine of compensation may be detected in these verses from the *Poenulus* of Plautus (286-87):

Non enim potis est quaestus fieri, ni sumptus sequitur, scio,
Et tamen quaestus non consistet, si eum sumptus superat, soror.

While these lines are not linked with pleasure and pain, nevertheless a certain connection between them and this Epicurean teaching is apparent. For the Plautine perception that no income is possible without attendant expense is the same as the Epicurean enunciation that without pain it is impossible sometimes to acquire pleasure; and the injunction to avoid expense which outweighs income is the same as the advice to avoid pain which a greater pleasure does not follow. This teaching is traceable also in Terence *And.* 546-49, 716-20, *Heaut.* 745-47.

The common conception that self-interest is served by the teachings of Epicurean ethics is exemplified by Ennius in his *Medea exul* 240:

Qui ipse sibi sapiens prodesse non quit, nequiquam sapit

and is thus treated by Terence in his *Andria* 426-27:

Verum illud verbumst, volgo quod dici solet,
Omnis sibi malle melius esse quam alteri.

Other instances of calculation for one's advantage are found in Plautus *Asin.* 186, *Bacch.* 654-62, *Cap.* 327, *Cur.* 28-38, *Mer.* 1011, *Trin.* 318-19, *Truc.* 932; Terence *And.* 543-49, *Heaut.* 746-47. In line with the teaching to take thought for one's interest are the familiar Epicurean exhortations to enjoy the good things of life while one can and to indulge one's inclinations, as Terence teaches in his *Heauton Timorumenos* 343-47:

CLIT. Quid ago nunc? CLIN. Tune? Quod boni. . . . CLIT. Syre! die modo

Verum. SY. Age modo: hodie sero ac nequiquam voles.

CLIN. Datur, fruare dum licet; nam nescias. . . .

CLIT. Syre, inquam! SY. Perge porro, tamen istuc ago.

CLIN. Ei(u)s sit potestas posthac an numquam tibi.

Similar sentiments are pronounced by Plautus *Amph.* 995-96, *Bacch.* 1193-95, *Cur.* 28-38, 176, *Mer.* 544-54, 1021-23, *Miles* 677, 706, and by Caecilius *Hym.* 70. On the other hand, the Epicureans emphasized the simple life and esteemed highly the man of few desires, as we learn from a fragment of an unknown comic poet (Ribbeck, II, 147, No. 65):

Is minimo eget mortalis, qui minimum cupit.

This teaching is encouraged by Ennius *Phoenix* 256; Plautus *Miles* 1214-15; Afranius *Eman.* 78; Turpilius *Lind.* 142-44; Auctor incertus *Inc. Fab.* 79-80 (= Ribbeck, II, 148, Nos. 66 and 67). An extension of the Epicurean exposition of the simple life is presented in a long passage by Plautus in his *Menaechmi* (446-59), where participation in politics, eschewed by the Epicureans, is protested.

Before coming to the concluding section of this study it is appropriate to direct attention to some general and miscellaneous sentiments, which, while not pertaining to a particular school, take their place in the philosophical tradition found in the Roman drama.

Here belong several quasi-proverbial sayings concerning wisdom, such as the verses from Ennius *Eum.* 132-33:

(Ita) sapere opino esse optimum, ut pro viribus
Tacere ac fabulari tute noveris

and the couplet from Turpilius *Can.* 9-10:

Ita est: verum haut facile est venire illi ubi sita est sapientia.
Spissum est iter: apisci haut possem nisi cum magna miseria.

While Cynic influence may be contained in the line from Caecilius *Inc. Fab.* 266:

Saepe est etiam sup palliolo sordido sapientia,

in his *Hecyra* 608 Terence teaches a semi-Cyrenaic attitude toward wisdom:

Istuc est sapere, qui ubiquomque opu' sit animum possis flectere.

And Plautus in his *Bacchides* 408 preserves a proverb to the effect that

Leniter qui saeviunt sapiunt magis,

with which may be matched another proverb from his *Persa* 729:

Dictum sapienti sat est.

In time of trouble equanimity is esteemed by Plautus in his *Rudens* 402:

Ergo animus aequos optimum est aerumnae condimentum.

Kindred counsel comes from Caecilius in his *Plocium* 176-77.

The value of good deeds is predicted by Plautus in his *Captivi* 358:

Quod bonis bene fit beneficium, gratia ea gravida est bonis.

Though the same poet also places emphasis on perseverance in well-doing when he teaches in his *Trinummus* 323:

Benefacta benefactis aliis pertegito, ne perpluant,

yet he puts in his *Poenulus* 633-36 these words of warning:

ADV. Malo bene facere tantumdemst periculum
Quantum bono male facere. LY. Qui vero? ADV. Scies.
Malo si quid bene facias, beneficium interit;
Bono si quid male facias, aetatem expetit.

To the same effect is an example from Ennius *Inc. Fab.* 389:

Bene facta male locata male facta arbitror.

In his *Trinummus* 320-22 Plautus presents the problem of self-examination:

Is probus est quem paenitet quam probu' sit et frugi bonae;
Qui ipsus sibi satis placet nec probus est nec frugi bonae:
Qui ipsus se contemnit, in eost indoles industriae.

And the consequences of a guilty conscience he considers in his *Mostellaria* 544:

Nihil est miserius quam animus hominis conscius.

An unknown comic poet thus describes the unhappy man (Ribbeck, II, 147, No. 64):

Non est beatus, esse se qui non putat.

Comments on particular philosophers as well as on philosophy in general are also contained in the dramas. Of the philosophers named or to whom unmistakable reference is made Thales leads the list. In his *Iphigenia* 199-201 Ennius entertains us with an amusing account of an ancient astronomer who was so engrossed in scrutinizing the stars that he failed to see what lay before his feet:

Astrologorum signa in caelo quaesit observat, Iovis
Cum capra aut nepa aut exoritur nomen aliquod beluarum.
Quod est ante pedes, noenu spectat: caeli scrutatur plagas.

The same story told on Thales is preserved by Plato *Theaetetus* 174A and by Diogenes Laertius *De vitis philosophorum* i. 34. Tribute to the wisdom of Thales is comically presented by Plautus in his *Bacchides* 121-24:

An non putasti esse umquam? O Lyde, es barbarus;
Quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem,
Is stultior es barbaro poticio,
Qui tantus natu deorum nescis nomina,

in his *Captivi* 274-75:

Eugepae! Thalem talento non emam Milesium,
Nam ad sapientiam huius <hominis> nimius nugator fuit,

and in his *Rudens* 1001-3:

GR. Quod scelus hodie hoc inveni! TR. Verba facimus, it dies.
Vide sis quouiis arbitratu nos vis facere. GR. Viduli
Arbitratu. <TR. Itane? GR.> Ita enim vero. TR. Stultus es. GR.
Salve, Thales.

Reference to Solon, who with Thales was included among the Seven Sages of Hellas, appears in an unidentified play of an unknown poet (Ribbeck, II, 132, No. 3):

In Venere sapere didicit ni mirum Solon,
Qui lege cavit, vitia uti transcenderent
Auctoris poenae: nulla poena acerbior
Excogitari potuit uxoris malis

and in the *Asinaria* of Plautus (598-600):

Audin hunc opera ut largus est nocturna? Nunc enim esse
Negotiosum interdus videlicet Solonem,
Leges ut conseribat quibus se populus teneat. Gerrae!

Laberius has left us part of a line on Pythagoras from his *Cancer* 17:

Nec Pythagoream dogmam doctus

and several lines on Democritus from his *Restio* 72-79:

Democritus Abderites physicus philosophus,
Clipeum constituit contra exortum Hyperionis,
Oculos effodere ut posset splendore aereo.
Ita radiis solis aciem effodit luminis,
Malis bene esse ne videret civibus.
Sic ego fulgentis splendorem pecuniae
Volo elucificare exitum aetati meae,
Ne in re bona esse videam nequam filium,

on which verses Gellius in his *Noctes Atticae* x. 17. 2-3 has an interesting comment concerning the poet's treatment of this tale. Plautus parodies the Socratic method in his *Pseudolus* 462-65:

CALL. Sunt quae te volumus percontari, quae quasi
Per nebulam nosmet scimus atque audivimus.
SIMO. Conficiet iam te hic verbis ut tu censeas
Non Pseudolum, sed Socratem tecum loqui.

Vulgarity is linked with the Cynics by Laberius in his *Compitalia* 36:

Sequere <me> in latrinum, ut aliquid gustes ex Cynica haeresi.

References to the Cynics occur also in Plautus *Per.* 123 and *Stich.* 703-4.

Opposition to philosophy occurs in the frequently cited line from Ennius *Inc. Fab.* 340:

Philosophari est mihi necesse, at paucis: nam omnino haut placet.

This repugnance is referred to philosophers by Pacuvius *Inc. Fab.* 348:

Odi ego homines ignava opera et philosopha sententia.

Plautus paints a picture of philosophers which probably achieved popular acclamation, when in his *Curculio* 288-95 he caricatures them thus:

Tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant,
Qui incedunt suffarcinati cum libris, cum sportulis,
Constant, conferunt sermones inter sese drapetae,
Opstant, opsistunt, incedunt cum suis sentiis,
Quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermopolio,
Vbi quid surrupuere: operto capitulo calidum bibunt,
Tristes atque ebrioli incedunt: eos ego si offendero,
Ex unoquoque eorum erepitum exciam polentarium.

In the *Antiopa* of Pacuvius one of the characters, called Zethus, in an argument with Amphion changed the conversation from a discussion of music to a disputation on wisdom and virtue, according to the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* ii. 27. 43. Other instances²⁹ of philosophizing on the part of the players in Roman drama appear in Plautus *Cap.* 284, *Mer.* 147, *Pseud.* 687, 971-74, *Rud.* 986, 1235-53, *Trin.* 485-87. In his *Andria* 57 Terence tells us that attendance upon philosophers is one of the usual pursuits of young men, and in his *Eunuchus* 262-64 he takes an illustration from the fact that schools of philosophers are called from their founders' names.

In view of this evidence from the Roman dramatists, which fulfils the findings of Abbott, Knapp, Korfmacher, and Schlesinger,³⁰ it seems scarcely probable that the playwrights would have permitted philosophical passages to stand in their plays, unless the average Roman playgoer of the pre-Ciceronian period had some superficial acquaintance with the principal Greek philosophers and philosophies.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

²⁹ See n. 19.

³⁰ See nn. 3 and 6.

IMPRISONMENT AS A PENALTY IN ANCIENT ATHENS

IRVING BARKAN

THE opinion generally held by scholars has been that imprisonment was not a regular mode of punishment among the Athenians. It is the purpose of this paper to show that the evidence in the sources substantiates an opposite view. G. F. Schoemann expresses the opinion of most scholars when he says, "Gefängnisz als Strafe für sich allein kommt nicht häufig vor, öfter als Strafschärfung oder als Zwangsmittel um Staatsschuldner zur Zahlung zu nöthigen, oder endlich als Mittel sich eines Angeklagten bis zum Urtheilsspruch zu versichern."¹ It is an accepted fact that persons accused of flagrant crimes were incarcerated to insure their appearance for trial. Likewise, criminals convicted and condemned to death were detained in prison until execution. Such detentions were, as a rule, of brief duration since execution followed soon after the pronouncement of sentence.² But the use of imprisonment as a cumulative penalty and the detention of state debtors until the satisfaction of their debt need closer investigation and bear directly upon this problem.

In Demosthenes we find the following:

If a man has recovered the article which he has lost, the thief shall be condemned to pay the double value; if not, to pay tenfold, besides the cumulative penalty; and he shall be kept in the stocks five days and as many nights [δεδέσθαι δ' ἐν τῇ ποδοκάκῃ τὸν πόδα πένθ' ἡμέρας καὶ νύκτας ἵσας], if the Heliastic tribunal shall have imposed such sentence.³

¹ *Griechische Alterthümer* (4th ed.; Berlin, 1897), I, 533. For similar view cf. J. J. Thonissen, *Le droit pénal de la république athénienne* (Brussels, 1876), p. 114; Th. Thalheim, "δεσμοτήριον" (Pauly-Wissowa). G. Gilbert states, "Imprisonment was never decreed except as an additional punishment" (*The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens* [London, 1895], p. 414).

² Xen. *Hell.* i. 7; Plut. *Phocion* 36; Antiphon v. 69; only under two circumstances was execution postponed. No one could be put to death before the return of the ship which the Athenians sent annually on a sacred mission to Delos (Plato *Phaedo* 58B). Pregnant women were granted a temporary reprieve until after the delivery of the fetus (Aelian *VH* v. 18).

³ xxxiv. 105 (Kennedy's version). Cf. *ibid.* 103, 114, 191.

Both Gernet⁴ and Caillemet⁵ concur in thinking that this cumulative penalty was not undergone in prison but was rather a sort of ignominious exposition before the public in the stocks (*ἐν ποδοκάκῃ, ἐν ξύλῳ δεδέσθαι*). But if it were exposition, are we to infer that the culprit was to be exposed at night too? A passage in Andocides, where the orator tells how the council imprisoned his friends and himself in the stocks, implies that it was not for the purpose of exposition at all: *ἡ δὲ βουλή ἐξεληθοῦσα ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ συνέλαβεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἔδησεν ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις*.⁶ This was evidently not outside but inside the prison. The reiteration of the fact at a later point in the speech,⁷ furthermore, makes it very clear that to be imprisoned in the stocks was merely a harsher form of imprisonment carried out within the prison walls. *Ἐν ξύλῳ δεδέσθαι*, then, means to be confined within the prison proper. That the term *ποδοκάκῃ* was synonymous with *ξύλον* and became obsolete in the fifth century we learn from Lysias who says—while quoting an old law of Solon in which the phrase *δεδέσθαι δ' ἐν τῇ ποδοκάκῃ* is found—*Ἡ ποδοκάκῃ αὕτη ἐστίν, ὃ νῦν καλεῖται ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ δεδέσθαι*.⁸ The usage of the word *ξύλον* in Lysias must be the same as that of his contemporary Andocides. The fact that imprisonment was employed as a cumulative penalty suggests the possibility that it was also used as a penalty per se.

Persons sentenced to a fine were sometimes incarcerated until the fine was paid.⁹ State debtors who failed to pay their debt at the appointed time were *ipso facto* liable to *ἀτιμία*.¹⁰ The state had the power to put defaulted debtors in prison—a punishment frequently resorted to as a deterrent against dilatoriness.¹¹ But what in the event of the defendant's failure to pay the debt? He would then be kept in prison indefinitely, and that would constitute, in fact, his punishment. The

⁴ "Sur l'exécution capitale," *Rev. des études grecques*, XXXVII-XXXVIII, 287.

⁵ "δεσμοτήριον" (Daremberg et Saglio).

⁶ i. 45.

⁷ *Ibid.* 48: *ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐδεδέμεθα πάντες ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ καὶ νύξ τε ἦν καὶ τὸ δεσμοτήριον συνεκέκλητο* (cf. i. 93).

⁸ x. 16; Dem. xxiv. 105.

⁹ Dem. xxi. 47; cf. xxv. 46; xxxiii. 1; liii. 11; lvi. 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, xxv. 53; cf. *ibid.* 4, 30.; Andocides i. 73.

¹¹ Dem. xxiv. 135; *Epist.* iii. 7, 16; Andocides i. 92-93.

logical supposition, then, is that imprisonment was regarded as an alternate penalty. Nor can we suppose that the Athenians would not consider imprisonment as a penalty since the state would have to incur the expense of supplying food to the inmates. The references to long terms in prison obviate this supposition. A certain Agyrrhius was imprisoned for many years until he had paid the public money which, it was found, he had in his hands.¹² Aristogeiton stayed in prison so long that he "was dried and shriveled up from long confinement."¹³ Speaking of Androtion, Demosthenes says, "Why, you know yourselves that his father spent many quinquennial periods in prison [πολλὰς πεντετηρίδας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ διατρίψαντα], and ran away at last without being discharged."¹⁴

So much for inferential evidence. That imprisonment was regarded as a corporal penalty by the Athenians we learn from Demosthenes, who says:

In the first place, men of the jury, it would not have been lawful for you to determine what penalty, corporal or pecuniary, a man should suffer [ὁ τι χρὴ παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτεῖσαι], for in the expression "corporal penalty" is included imprisonment [ἐν γὰρ τῷ παθεῖν καὶ ὁ δεσμός ἐστι].¹⁵

In the same speech of Demosthenes we find the following statement, ". . . People have been imprisoned ere now both for debt and upon judgments [καίτοι καὶ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἤδη τινὲς ἐδόθησαν καὶ ἐπὶ κρίσεσιν]."¹⁶ With reference to requisitions imposed by the state upon citizens in order to carry out expeditions by land and sea, the orator says: "To enforce these obligations, you impanel juries and pass sentence of imprisonment upon the refractory."¹⁷ This implies that imprisonment was resorted to as a penalty in the case of those who shirked the burden of contribution to the state.¹⁸ The author of the speech *Against Alcibiades*, attributed to Andocides, lists imprisonment in the category of penalties such as exile and death. According to the oath of the people and the council, no one could be exiled or imprisoned or put to

¹² Dem. xxiv. 135.

¹³ *Ibid.*, xxv. 61; cf. Din. ii. 2: ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ πλείω χρόνον ἢ ἕξω διατρίψε.

¹⁴ Dem. xxiv. 125. W. Wayte, in his edition of Demosthenes *Against Androtion* and *Against Timocrates*, in a note *ad loc.*, remarks that it is comic exaggeration, but what of the other references to long imprisonment, i.e., Dem. xxiv. 135; xxv. 61; Din. ii. 2?

¹⁵ Dem. xxiv. 146.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 132.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 92; cf. li. 4.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

death without due process of the law.¹⁹ Again, in Demosthenes we find: "... For the courts of justice decide all questions that are brought to trial, and they are empowered to pass sentence of imprisonment, or any other sentence that they please."²⁰

When Socrates was asked to propose a counterpenalty he said: "What penalty shall I propose? Imprisonment? And why should I live in prison [καὶ τί με δεῖ ζῆν ἐν δεσμοτρητίῳ], a slave to those who may be in authority?"²¹ In the speech *Against Andocides*, attributed to Lysias, we find the following statement: "For Andocides, when after his offense he was brought before the court by a summary citation, committed himself to prison having assessed the penalty at imprisonment if he failed to hand over his attendant."²² The use of the word *τιμωσάμενος* in the foregoing passages seems to be conclusive evidence that imprisonment was a normal penalty in Athens. In Plato's *Laws* imprisonment is a usual penalty.²³ That his laws are based upon Athenian legal practice is evidenced by his stipulation in case of outrage. A citizen convicted of an act of outrage (*δίκη αἰκίας*) was to be imprisoned for not less than one year, but a stranger or a resident alien was to be imprisoned for two years.²⁴ It is noteworthy that in Athens, too, the laws of imprisonment were more stringent in the case of delinquent aliens.²⁵ When the evidence is weighed, it seems indisputable that imprisonment was a penalty per se in Athens and was probably used even more frequently than the sources indicate.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹⁹ Andocides iv. 3. Again in iv. 4 incarceration is listed as one of the penalties: ἐξόν κολάζειν χρήμασι καὶ δεσμῷ καὶ θανάτῳ.

²⁰ xxiv. 151.

²¹ Plato *Apol.* 37C.

²² Lysias vi. 21: ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν τιμωσάμενος δεσμοῦ.

²³ viii. 847; ix. 864E, 880B; x. 890, 908; xii. 955.

²⁴ *Ibid.* ix. 880C.

²⁵ J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* (Leipzig, 1915), p. 947.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE TREATY OF PEACE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE SECOND MACEDONIAN WAR

A re-reading of the sources has led me to the conclusion that most accounts of the treaty—and this includes a brief account by myself¹—make a mistake when they take for granted that Pol. xviii. 44 and Livy xxxiii. 30 contain statements of the terms of the treaty. Instead, they contain summaries of a *senatus consultum* giving instructions to the ten commissioners concerning how the affairs of Greece are to be settled, arranging details of the application of the peace, and imposing some additional conditions on Philip. The new conditions are concerned with the surrender of the Macedonian fleet and the payment of indemnity.² The terms of the treaty proper must be sought elsewhere. Appian (*Mac.* 9. 3) has an excellent statement that will be quoted not primarily as a proof of the course events took but as a proof that at least one of the later historians of antiquity presented an account that is in essential agreement with the conclusions to which an analysis, chiefly of Polybius, has led the present writer. Yet it should be noted that on this point Appian's account seems to be based on good material and so should carry some weight. His statement is as follows: τὴν μὲν εἰρήνην ἡ βουλὴ μαθοῦσα ἐπεκύρωσε, τὰς δὲ προτάσεις τὰς Φλαμίνιου σμικρύνασα καὶ φαυλίσασα, ἐκέλευσε, κ.τ.λ. Then, after a summary of the *senatus consultum* he concludes: τὰδε μὲν ἡ βουλὴ προσέθηκε, καὶ Φίλιππος ἐδέξατο ἅπαντα. The statement indicates clearly that the senate ratified the treaty presented to it and then proceeded to issue additional orders. Appian places all his emphasis on the fact that the senate considered the terms offered by Flamininus as too generous³ and so mistakenly represents the entire document as consisting of harsher terms imposed upon Philip. Yet, even so, he distinguishes clearly between these additional demands and the original treaty ratified by the senate.

In order to determine the terms of the original treaty it is necessary first to note the agreement made between Flamininus and Philip. The latter offered a definite treaty on the terms that he would grant all the former demands of the Romans and their allies and that he would leave all other questions to the decision of the senate. This is reported in the following words by Polybius and Livy: ἐφη γὰρ τὰ μὲν πρότερον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων

¹ CP, XXX (1935), 200–201.

² Here the problem of the clauses added by Livy to the statement of Polybius can be ignored. They are rejected by most scholars.

³ On this point cf. Schwartz, s.v. "Appianus" in Pauly-Wissowa, II, 219 f.

ἐπιταττόμενα πάντα συγχωρεῖν καὶ ποιῆσειν, περὶ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν διδόναι τῇ συγκλήτῳ τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν (Pol. xviii. 38. 2), "Quae priore colloquio aut imperata a Romanis aut postulata ab sociis essent, omnia se concedere, de ceteris senatui permissurum dixit" (Livy xxxiii. 13. 4). In both versions it is perfectly clear that Philip offers to make peace on terms already suggested by the Romans and their allies and that he is willing to leave all details not covered by these terms to the final decision of the senate. If this treaty is ratified by Rome, it is not necessary to refer these decisions of the senate back to Philip for ratification. These must have been the terms on the basis of which Philip was permitted to send ambassadors to Rome (Pol. xviii. 39. 5; Livy xxxiii. 13. 14), and these must have been the terms proposed by his ambassadors to the senate.

This interpretation is confirmed by the account of Polybius (xviii. 42) of the later proceedings at Rome. After considerable debate the senate decided to ratify the peace proposed. The words ἐδόκει βεβαιοῦν τὰς ὁμολογίας cannot possibly mean to continue negotiations with the object of drawing up a treaty. When the treaty was submitted to the people, Marcus (Marcellus) tried to prevent its ratification but ὁ γὰρ δῆμος . . . ἐπεκύρωσε τὰς διαλύσεις. When this had been done, the senate selected the commission of ten described as τοὺς χειροῦντας τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετὰ τοῦ Τίτου καὶ βεβαιώσοντας τοῖς Ἕλλησι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν. This account clearly implies that the ten commissioners were not to make peace, but that peace already had been made and that their task was to arrange the affairs of Greece. This must mean that the ambassadors of Philip were authorized before they left home to take the oath constituting the final ratification of the peace provided that the terms offered proved acceptable to Rome.

It must be admitted that the foregoing interpretation is contradicted by two passages in Livy. The decision to select the ten commissioners is reported in the following words: "Decem legati more maiorum, quorum ex consilio T. Quinctius imperator leges pacis Philippo daret, decreti" (xxxiii. 24. 7). Here it is implied that the ten commissioners are to co-operate with Flamininus in drawing up the conditions for peace. Again, the document described above as a *senatus consultum* is introduced by the words "Decem legati ab Roma venerunt, quorum ex consilio pax data Philippo in has leges est, ut . . ." (xxxiii. 30. 1). This statement agrees with the preceding one and implies that the document is what scholars have taken it for—a summary of the treaty of peace. These two statements, however, are contradicted by the account in xxxiii. 25. 4-7 of the debate in Rome on the question of peace and of the ratification of the peace by the *comitia*. The *rogatio* is described in the following words: "vellent iuberentque cum rege Philippo pacem esse." The question is not one of authorizing negotiations but of accepting a definite treaty proposed. This interpretation is further confirmed by the following statement: "Et quo magis pacem ratam esse in Macedonia vulgo laetarentur, tristis ex Hispania adlatus nuntius effecit" (xxxiii. 25. 8). The joy over the

fact that the peace with Macedonia had been ratified was increased by the arrival of sad news from Spain. This account of Livy, which agrees with Polybius, must be correct. Thus the document given in Pol. xviii. 44 and Livy xxxiii. 30 must be what Polybius calls it, a *senatus consultum* (τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα).⁴ Consequently, as already has been said, it is necessary to look elsewhere for the terms of the treaty.

It has been shown above that the treaty was concluded on the basis of the demands earlier submitted to Philip by the Romans and their allies. This, as all will admit, can refer only to the conference at Nicaea. At the time these demands were presented to Philip in writing (Pol. xviii. 7. 7). These written statements have not been preserved, and so the demands can be determined only from the statements reported to have been made at the conference by the participants. This, no doubt, will give an incomplete and imperfect picture of the terms of the later treaty, but it is the best that can be done at present. The demands of various participants will be listed below. The statement is based on Pol. xviii. 1-2 (cf. Livy xxxii. 33).

I. Romans

1. Withdrawal from Greece
2. Surrender of prisoners and deserters to all belligerents
3. Surrender to the Romans of all conquests made in Illyria after the Peace of Epirus (Phoenice)
4. Restoration to Ptolemy of all cities taken away from him after the death of Philopator

II. Attalus

1. Restoration of ships and prisoners taken in the Battle of Chios
2. Restoration of the temple of Aphrodite and of the Nicephorium

III. Rhodians

1. Evacuation of the Peraea
2. Withdrawal of garrisons from Iasus, Bargylia, and Euromus
3. Restoration of Perinthus to its sympolity with Byzantium
4. Withdrawal from Sestus and Abydus
5. Withdrawal from all trading posts and harbors in Asia

IV. Achaeans

The restoration of Argos and Corinth

V. Aetolians

1. Withdrawal from Greece (the same as the first demand of the Romans)
2. Restoration of cities that had formerly been members of the League

These conditions were all accepted by Philip in his treaty with Rome. The treaty, however, had been contracted as a dual treaty between Rome and Macedonia and contained the proviso that on any additional questions the Roman senate was to have the final decision. This meant that even for the execution of his promises to the other belligerents Philip was ultimately re-

⁴ In this particular passage δόγμα has been supplied by the editors. It is certainly correct. It is absolutely necessary for the understanding of the passage and is confirmed by the following chapter where the document twice is called a δόγμα (45. 1).

sponsible only to Rome, and that Rome was to have the exclusive right to determine the manner in which the treaty was to be executed and the manner in which the territory surrendered by Philip should be disposed of. Under the circumstances it was natural that the senate should lay down the main lines of the settlement but leave the details to Flamininus and the commission of ten. The result was the *senatus consultum* already frequently mentioned.

It remains to test the theory stated above by comparing the clauses in the *senatus consultum* with the demands made of Philip at Nicaea. This means that an attempt will be made to determine whether the *senatus consultum* is a document which can be explained as one regulating the application of a treaty based on the demands made at Nicaea and amplifying the treaty when necessary. Naturally clauses in the treaty not mentioned in the *senatus consultum* did not thereby cease to be binding. There was no need of mentioning points that did not need clarification. Thus nothing is said about Illyria, probably for the reason that Philip already had been expelled from the places in question. The clause in the treaty merely meant that he renounced his claim to them. Of course, it is possible that some point in the treaty might be allowed to become a dead letter. The failure to mention Ptolemy in the *senatus consultum* does not mean that Philip was permitted to retain cities that he had taken from Ptolemy, but it may mean, for instance, that if any such cities had later been occupied by Antiochus, Philip was not compelled to try to reconquer them in order to hand them over to Ptolemy. Again, if any city that Philip was directed to evacuate and set free had been taken from Ptolemy, this may mean that Rome felt free to change her opinion concerning the disposal of the cities. After all, their surrender was based merely on a demand made by Rome and on no agreement made with Ptolemy.⁵

The first clause in the *senatus consultum* admirably fits the theory defended above. The demands of the Romans and the Aetolians contained the demand that Philip withdraw from Greece; the demands of the Rhodians, that he withdraw from Asia. This naturally left open the question of the future fate of the surrendered territory. The *senatus consultum* disposed of the question by ruling that all Greek states both of Asia and of Europe for which other arrangements were not made should be free.⁶

The treaty had informed Philip concerning what he was to evacuate but not when and how. He was now instructed to surrender to the Romans before the Isthmian games the cities and forts that he held garrisoned. This, by the way, left the future disposal of these cities undetermined. This clause at first seems to apply to all garrisoned cities and forts but it is modified by a

⁵ Thus it is unsafe to argue, as Holleaux does (*CAH*, VIII, 181, n. 1), that the cities ordered set free had not belonged to Ptolemy before they were occupied by Philip.

⁶ It is hardly necessary to say that the foregoing statement follows the *τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας πάντας* of Polybius and not the *omnes Graecorum civitates* of Livy which appears to be a mistranslation of the former.

list of cities mentioned by name that he is to evacuate and set free without handing them over to the Romans.

The treaty had specified that prisoners and deserters should be restored. The *senatus consultum* now ordered that this should be done before the Isthmian games.⁷ It is not clear whether this order applies only to the Roman prisoners or to all prisoners. The ἀπαρτας of Polybius seems to imply that all prisoners whatsoever are to be surrendered to the Romans. The latter would then, doubtless, restore them to their respective states. Nevertheless, it is very likely that only Roman prisoners are meant. In that case the treaty would still bind Philip to surrender prisoners and deserters to his other opponents. If that were not done, the natural course to pursue would be to complain to Flamininus and the ten commissioners and request them to bring pressure to bear.

The *senatus consultum* says nothing specifically concerning the ships to be restored to Attalus, or, by this time, Eumenes. Unless this point was considered covered by the general demand for the surrender of the fleet of Philip, it was merely a detail concerning which the senate saw no need of making a ruling. The clause of the treaty would still be binding.

One of the most striking proofs that the interpretation given above is correct is the clause that instructs Flamininus to write to Prusias concerning the freedom of the Cians. Such a clause would be out of place and almost absurd in a treaty between Rome and Philip but would be highly proper in a document in which the senate gave directions for the settlement following the peace between the two states.

All the clauses so far considered lend themselves perfectly to the theory put forward above. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the *senatus consultum* imposes additional burdens on Philip. Even when the clauses of doubtful authenticity given by Livy are disregarded, there remain the clauses concerning the surrender of the greater part of the Macedonian fleet and the clause concerning the payment of an indemnity.⁸ The accounts of Polybius and Appian and one of the statements of Livy imply that the treaty had been ratified before the ten commissioners appeared in Greece and thus that these burdens were imposed upon Philip after peace had been made by the simple command of the senate. It is possible that they were justified on the basis of the clause in the treaty leaving further details to the senate, though this clause could hardly have been understood by Philip to justify the imposition of additional burdens upon himself. Yet since Rome was strong, her interpretation prevailed, and Appian informs us that Philip accepted the terms. This need not

⁷ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς χρόνοις (Pol.). Livy does not indicate the time.

⁸ It is possible that the two hundred talents deposited with Flamininus at the time of the armistice (Pol. xviii. 39. 5; Livy xxxiii. 13. 14) were to be retained as an indemnity, but the *senatus consultum* (Pol. xviii. 44. 7; Livy xxxiii. 30. 7; Appian *Mac.* 9. 3) demanded an indemnity of one thousand talents.

mean a new ratification of the treaty on his part. It probably means no more than that he surrendered the ships and paid the indemnity when he was ordered so to do.

Nevertheless, it is possible that the ceremony of ratification was repeated after the arrival of the ten commissioners in Greece. In the case of the peace between Rome and Antiochus III our sources state even more definitely that the treaty was ratified at Rome (Pol. xxi. 24. 3; Livy xxxvii. 55. 3). In spite of this the ratification was repeated at Apamea and, in addition, Roman ambassadors sent to Syria to exact oaths from the king (Pol. xxi. 42-44; Livy xxxviii. 37-39). This suggests that a similar ratification may have taken place also in connection with the peace with Philip, though this is by no means certain. The treaty with Antiochus as first negotiated did not contain any clause granting final authority to the senate. Therefore, if any additions to the treaty were made at Rome, it would be necessary to refer it back to the king for ratification. It is not certain that this was necessary in the case of the treaty with Philip. It is more likely that it, in the same manner as the Aetolian treaty of 189 (Pol. xxi. 32), received its final ratification at Rome.

In other respects a review of the negotiations with Antiochus confirms the interpretation of the treaty with Philip given above. The treaty with Antiochus was put into final form before its ratification at Rome. Though Livy xxxviii. 38. 1 tells that the final form was due to the ten commissioners, this statement finds no support in Polybius and, what is more important, is contradicted by the following incident: When the Rhodians after ratification of the treaty at Rome demanded Soli, the ambassadors of Antiochus were able to refuse to grant the demand and to insist on the terms of the treaty (Pol. xxi. 24. 10-15; Livy xxxvii. 56. 7-10). Appian (*Syr.* 39) clearly is telling the truth when he states that the treaty was recorded and deposited at Rome and that a copy sent to Manlius Vulso was used at the ratification at Apamea.⁹

⁹ The fact that the treaty was not modified by Manlius and the commissioners has been recognized by Mommsen, *Römische Forschungen*, II, 525 f.; De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, IV, 206. Against this Täubler (*Imperium Romanum*, I, 103 ff.) has maintained that a change was made in the clause on indemnities. The preliminary treaty required the payment of 2,500 talents when the treaty had been ratified at Rome (Pol. xxi. 17. 4-5; Livy xxxvii. 45. 14; Appian *Syr.* 38), and this sum was actually paid not only before the ratification at Apamea but before the arrival of the commissioners (Pol. xxi. 41. 8-12; Livy xxxviii. 37. 7-9). The treaty as finally ratified does not mention this sum but speaks only of the 12,000 talents still due. Obviously a reference to a sum already paid would have been out of place. A clause of the kind common in treaties to the effect that Antiochus was to pay 2,500 talents immediately would have implied an additional payment. Thus, if the treaty when ratified at Rome contained such a clause, it must have been deleted by Manlius and the commissioners. Such a change would have been little more than a clerical correction bringing the document up to date and would not involve a real modification of the treaty. On the other hand, it is possible that even this clause was drafted at Rome in its final form, that the clause in the preliminary treaty concerning the 2,500 talents was considered sufficient, and that Manlius was ordered to collect the sum before the final ratification of the treaty.

It seems, therefore, that the treaties with Philip, Antiochus, and the Aetolians all were alike in that they were put into their final form before they were ratified at Rome. Thus the *senatus consultum* adopted after this ratification cannot have modified the treaty proper. Furthermore the treaty with Antiochus states what territory the king is to cede (Pol. xxi. 43. 5; Livy xxxviii. 38. 4) but has nothing to say concerning what is later to be done with the territory. As far as the treaty is concerned, the land in question became subject to Rome (Pol. xxi. 43. 15; Livy xxxviii. 38. 10). This suggests that the clause in the *senatus consultum* concerning the freedom of the Greeks was not a part of the treaty. For the treaty with Philip we have nothing corresponding to the statement of the treaty with Antiochus given in Pol. xxi. 43 and Livy xxxviii. 38. The document given in Pol. xviii. 44 and Livy xxxiii. 30 is rather to be compared to the instructions given by the senate to the ten commissioners before their departure for Asia (Pol. xxi. 24. 6-9; Livy xxxvii. 55. 4-6, 56. 1-6).

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

SOME DEBATED PASSAGES IN THE TEXT OF SENECA'S *DE CLEMENTIA*

The *De beneficiis* and the *De clementia* depend for their text on the manuscript known as Nazarianus, preserved in the Vatican Library (Vaticano-Palatinus, 1547). While later studies have inclined scholars to some modification of Gertz's attitude of entire dependence on N to the practical exclusion of all other manuscript authority, no one has seriously questioned N's unique quality. It is to the readings therefore of N that I have invariably directed attention in the following pages as the thing which must fundamentally and primarily be taken into account in discussing any improvement of the text of the *De clementia*.

Reference is constantly made in this article to Hosius' second edition of the *De beneficiis* and the *De clementia*,¹ and all quotations of passages to be discussed are taken from that source, with the page numbers placed in parentheses after the usual chapter and section citation. Gertz is quoted from his edition of the same works;² his critical notes in the extensive Appendix are invaluable. Préchac's brilliant and disturbing edition of the *De clementia* is dated 1921.³ Professor Basore's first volume of the *Moral Essays of Seneca*⁴ has been constantly consulted in considering the meaning of passages.

¹ Teubner, 1914.

² Weidmann, 1876.

³ Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."

⁴ "Loeb Library," 1928.

The editions of Fickert⁵ and Haase⁶ have been always at hand for reference, and a number of dissertations and papers in the journals have been examined.

i. 3. 1 (214): *Nunc in tres partes omnem hanc materiam dividam. Prima erit manumissionis.*

This is the reading of N, but it should be observed⁷ that *manu* is clearly separated in the manuscript from *missionis*. Though Hosius reads *manumissionis* without any indication of distress, as also Fickert and Haase, they stand alone in so doing; I cannot see how they interpreted it to meet what seem the obvious needs of the passage. The critical notes in the editions of Hosius and Préchac exhibit the various conjectural attempts to emend the text. Préchac himself, while reading in his edition *humanissimi Neronis*, proposes in his Introduction:⁸ *manu mitissimi Neronis* ("of Nero, supremely gentle in act"); and from the course of the argument there this would appear to be his last word on the subject. Either of these changes involves a huge transposition of the material of the *De clementia*.

In my own opinion it is probable that *missio* means "discharge," where you "let (the other person) go" without punitive action on your part. Cf. *Dial.* iii. 20. 8, where *Ad pugnam vocavit Iovem et quidem sine missione* means "he challenged Jupiter to combat, and that too a combat without quarter." Also in Petronius 52, *missionem puero dedit*, the sense is "He gave the boy a discharge," that is, let him off without doing anything to him. *Epistles* xxxvii. 2, on the other hand, I do not consider analogous.

What then of *manu*? I am inclined to see in it evidence of the adjective *humanae*, so divided at some point in the manuscript tradition that *hu* terminated one line and *manae* began the next. One might compare in this connection the disappearance of *ve* from *verecundia* in N at i. 16. 3,⁹ noting that in N the preceding word *et* terminates a line. It is possible that a succeeding copyist dropped the *hu*; in that case *manae missionis* might well suggest easy correction into *manu missionis*. It must always be remembered, as was stated in the beginning of this note, that *manu* is distinctly separated from *missionis* in N.

This produces *prima erit <hu> manae missionis*, "The first part shall treat of merciful discharge." It will be observed that a number of instances of just that kind of thing occur in the remainder of Book i, while in general all of Book i is taken up with a discussion of the obligation imposed on the great to be merciful. No doubt the phrase *humanae missionis* is unusual, but I feel that, had N provided just those two words, no serious question would ever have arisen about their interpretation.

⁵ Weidmann, 1843.

⁶ Teubner, 1874.

⁷ Préchac, Intro., p. xcvii.

⁸ P. xcvi.

⁹ Hosius, p. 233, l. 6.

- i. 3. 5 (215): . . . cum ille [i.e., *animus*] *inperavit, sive avarus dominus est, mare lucri causa scrutamur, sive ambitiosus, iam dudum dextram flammis obiecinus aut voluntarii terram subsiluimus.*

Voluntarii terram is Hosius' emendation of N's *voluntariam*; Préchac follows Hosius, but inserts *in* before *terram*. It is generally assumed that the second reference in the passage must be to the devotion of himself by M. Curtius as recorded in Livy vii. 6, and that, too, despite the obvious difficulty pointed out by Gertz¹⁰ that *subsilio* always means "to leap up" and not "to leap down," as the Curtius story would require. Lipsius had sought to meet this difficulty long before with his *sub solum ivimus*.

Probably it would be sounder to begin without any prejudice in favor of the Curtius story and examine the manuscript text on its own merits. *Voluntariam* suggests a missing noun for it to modify, and *mortem* seems, in the circumstances, fairly obvious; we may thus arrive at *voluntariam* (<*in mortem*>) *subsiluimus*. That is conceivably a description of suicide; the act is contemplated, the resolve taken, and finally we leap up (and the "up" is important) to accomplish the act itself. Certainly the motive present in many of the great suicides of antiquity was to a large degree what is implied in the adjective *ambitiosus*; many of them mark that love of the dramatic in this regard which will be familiar to those who follow the news in the Italian newspapers of today. I do not pretend to say what particular case Seneca had in mind, but there was always a Brutus or a Cato upon whom to fall back. Whatever faults may attach to the suggested explanation, it has at least the merit of (1) starting from the text of N and not from any preconception of what it should say, (2) avoiding an impossible view of the verb *subsiluimus*. It also gives a reference to an unalterable act, suicide, parallel in that respect with the destruction of one's hand by fire, and hence fits the needs of the passage. The perfect tenses *obiecinus* . . . *subsiluimus*, to which Gertz so strongly objects, point to the irreversible nature of the acts, done and not to be undone.

- i. 11. 2 (226): *Haec est in maxima potestate verissima animi temperantia et humani generis comprehendens ut sui amor non cupiditate aliqua, non temeritate ingenii . . . quantum sibi in cives suos liceat, experiendo temptare, sed hebetare aciem inperii sui.*

Thus reads Hosius, accepting Gertz's conjectural *comprendens ut sui amor* for the *compraenditte sibi mor* of N. On this Préchac comments, justly, I think, "vix latine," to say nothing of the fact that it is difficult to relate it paleographically to the manuscript reading. Préchac, in his very ingenious but most unconvincing critical note on page 29 of his edition, regards *comprendit aes ibi*, as he reads it, as a gloss to *cupiditate aliqua*, and consequently excises it, reading *amor* for *mor*. To my mind that is even more improbable than Gertz's conjecture.

¹⁰ P. 265.

Let us assume that *compr[a]endit te sibi* is sound; in that case the correction must center around the isolated *mor*. It is a small foundation on which to build, and I therefore merely hazard the following as a possible completion of the sense: *<temperantissimum ti>*. This makes the sentence read: . . . *et humani generis comprehendit te sibi temperantissimum timor*. This I regard as parenthetical purely, suggested to Seneca by *temperantia* preceding, which now reappears in the form *temperantissimum*. I translate: " . . . and the dread felt by the human race realizes that you are most self-controlled toward it"; *humani generis timor* in that case is equivalent, according to a common Silver Latin figure, to "the human race which was entertaining dread." For the fact that such was the state of the popular mind at the time of Nero's succession to the throne see i. 1. 7: *Magnam adibat aleam populus Romanus cum incertum esset, quo se ista tua nobilis indoles daret*. Now the people—the whole human race, in fact—has learned better; *comprendit te sibi temperantissimum*.

- i. 26. 1 (242): *Quid enim potest quisquam ab eo sperare, quem malum esse docuit? Non diu nequitia adparet nec, quantum iubetur, peccat.*

N shows *appareret*, for which Lipsius wrote *apparet* and Muretus *paret*; the latter satisfies the sense but not the manuscript reading. Despite Gertz's argument¹¹ that *adparet* is equivalent to *paret*, the *Thesaurus* (II, 267, II) shows that *adpareo* is used in the literal "obey" sense almost exclusively of obedience in state functions, and almost invariably with an attendant dative indicating the official to whom service or allegiance is rendered. As for the metaphorical sense, the quotations are patristic and will not help here.

I would suggest reading: *non diu nequitia <uitia> adparat*; "villainy does not long (merely) prepare vicious deeds," that is, execute them only at the bidding of others. The *uitia* are the *perfidia*, *impietas*, *feritas* of the preceding sentence, vices in which *nequitia* (i.e., *nequam homines*) serves the tyrant to begin with, but in the end turns around and practices them upon himself. *<Uitia> adparat* gives the natural balance to *quantum iubetur, peccat*; the latter indeed seems just a more prosaic explanation of *<uitia> adparat*. In Seneca himself¹² we find: *Nefanda iuveni crimina insonti apparat*.

Once *uitia* was lost by the easiest of haplographies, *adparat* would naturally be bent in the *adparet* direction, in spite of usage as cited above, to give it meaning; and of this the *appareret* of N is evidence. The fact that *iubetur* is Muretus' conjecture for the *videtur* of N does not prejudicially affect my suggestion of *uitia*; on the contrary, my reading *<uitia> adparat* is, as already noted, singularly corroborative of the necessary *iubetur*.

- ii. 2. 3 (245): *Ac nescio quomodo ingenia in inmani et invisa materia secundiore ore expresserunt sensus vehementes et concitatos; nullam adhuc vocem audii ex bono lenique animosam.*

The text of N reads: *ingenia immania . . . secundiora*; Lipsius altered *immania* to *inmani*, *secundiora* to *secundiore*, and added *ore* after *secundiore*.

¹¹ P. 280.

¹² *Phaedra* 825.

Madvig inserted *in* before *inmani* (thus all modern editors for *immani*). I agree with Préchac that *secundiore ore* is, as Latin, very infelicitous.

The passage clearly indicates a contrast between the spirited utterances of detestable characters such as despots and tyrants and the tamer expressions of the gentle and the good (*vocem ex bono lenique*). It seems to me therefore that *inmania* (so N) is a necessary epithet to the noncommittal word *ingenia*, and should not be changed. In that case *et* is not connective but emphatic, and a comma is required before it and also apparently after *materia*. Of the latter point, however, we cannot be sure until *secundiora* has been dealt with; here Préchac is almost certainly right with his *secundiora*. All that is now necessary is to punctuate with a comma after *secundiora* and to insert *in* either before *invisa* or, preferably, before *materia*.

I read therefore as follows: *Ac nescio quomodo ingenia inmania, et invisa in materia fecundiora, expresserunt sensus vehementes et concitatos*, which I translate: "And somehow or other, cruel natures, more prolific in (dealing with) even detestable material, have given utterance to violent and passionate sentiments." To this the response is: "Never yet have I heard a spirited speech from one who was good and gentle." The sentence has now been provided with exact balance and full force for its connection in the paragraph, and the reading suggested comes very close indeed to the manuscript tradition.

ii. 7. 1 (250): '*At quare non ignoscet?*' *Agedum constituamus nunc quoque quid sit venia, et sciemus dari illam a sapiente non debere.*

N (and all manuscripts): *vacuam constituamus*, and, after *quid sit*, *veniam*. It will be observed therefore that *agedum* is a somewhat bold replacement by Hosius for the *vacuam* of N.

N is a manuscript of few abbreviations;¹³ but it is a notable fact that two of the outstanding exceptions to this state of affairs occur in the immediate vicinity of our passage, namely, ii. 6. 4: *mia* for *miser cordia*, and ii. 7. 3: *iud* for *iudices*. I am influenced by this circumstance to believe that we may have in the *va* of *vacuam* an abbreviation, or rather the slightly altered form of an abbreviation, for *veniam*, that is, *via* with a virgula above it, like the *mia* quoted above, and that the original reading was *veniam tuam*. Compare Johann Mueller's conjecture *venia tua*, evidently based on the same idea. *Veniam tuam* follows reasonably enough after the interlocutor's question "*At quare non ignoscet?*" which, of course, takes us back to the beginning of ii. 5. 2; it means: "the pardon you suggest by your question." When *veniam tuam* had become corrupted into *vacuam*, *veniam* (so N) was added after *quid sit* to supply the necessary object for *constituamus* and to fill out the obvious drift of the sentence. Read therefore: *veniam tuam* for *vacuam* and *quid sit* [*veniam*].

¹³ Préchac, Intro., p. viii.

It is, of course, possible to argue with Kronenberg¹⁴ that the question "At . . . ignoscet?" is an interpolation and *vacuum* an unfavorable comment on it, and that therefore the new paragraph commences with *constituamus*; but the point in asking the question, namely, that the subject proposed in ii. 5. 2 (*sapientem . . . negat ignoscere*) may now be taken up, is too obvious to permit of an interpolation theory. With its rejection, the notion of an ironical *vacuum* fails too.

It is a singular thing that Seneca's prose writings have been preserved to us in comparatively poor condition considering his high reputation as a man of letters in his own day and his great vogue among the fathers of the Early Church and indeed throughout the whole medieval period. Only a small portion of the acute critical faculty developed during the last century of classical scholarship has been directed toward the establishment of a better text for the brilliant Silver Latin stylist, and it is no reflection on those editors and commentators who have occupied themselves with Seneca to say that there is much that remains to be done. And, despite the doubts of the illustrious Bourguery as to what can be accomplished, the present writer is bold enough to believe that there is ground for hope that closer studies of the Senecan phraseology and manner could considerably improve the state of the text. Even the refutation of attempts at emendation will likely in the end serve a positive purpose by establishing more securely the basis for a general recension of Seneca's prose works, nor is the volume of extant comment so large as to discourage the effort to understand what attempts have been already made.

W. H. ALEXANDER

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE *MENOLOGIA RUSTICA*

Two stone calendars in the form of altars, found in Rome and published by Mommsen in CIL, I², 280-81, as the *Menologium rusticum Colotianum* and *Menologium rusticum Vallense*, are sometimes cited in connection with problems of early Roman religion.¹ Since an interpretation of the calendar festivals depends in part upon an exact knowledge of the dates within which each important agricultural operation took place in the vicinity of Rome, it is important to decide before using them as evidence whether these calendars or their original, for they derive from a single source,² really referred to the district around Rome. Scholars have generally assumed that this was so, probably for the reasons which Wissowa gives in his article *Römische Bauernkalender*.

¹⁴ CQ, XVII, 48.

¹ W. W. Fowler, *The Roman Festivals* (London, 1916), pp. 215 and 252; J. G. Frazer, *The Fasti of Ovid* (London, 1929), III, 396.

² Georg Wissowa, "Römische Bauernkalender," in *Apophoreton* (Überreicht von der Graeca Halensis) (Berlin: Weidmann, 1903), p. 30.

der,³ namely, that the information about the average length of days and nights given by the calendars in each month is correct for the latitude of Rome, that the stated times for agricultural work suit no Italian place so well as this city, and that the foundation days of state Roman temples are mentioned. As for the last, references to state temples would certainly attach the calendars to Rome if they were of great antiquity, but as they undoubtedly date from the Empire (the Isis festival of Heuresis is included)—a time when all Italy had long since accepted Rome's calendar—this argument does not hold. Nor can we fix the source of the *Menologia* with any degree of exactness by their calculations as to average length of days per month, since a quarter of an hour is the smallest unit indicated and one locality within at least two degrees of latitude would suit as well as another. It is not improbable, too, that tables of calculations such as these, even if intended for Rome, might be used throughout Italy, without much inquiry as to their exactness. That details of mathematical correctness were overlooked in the case of these two calendars is evident, as Wissowa points out, in the fact that calculations for separate months do not balance each other in accordance with any rational system in either calendar.

Let us next examine Wissowa's most important point, that the times stated for agricultural work suit no Italian location so well as Rome. As test cases one should choose (as Wissowa does not) operations which by their very nature are confined to a short and definite period of time, as, for instance, the principal grain harvest, that of spelt and wheat. According to Varro, most farmers reaped in the period between the summer solstice and the rising of Canicula, or from June 24 to July 26.⁴ Pliny lists as work to be done in the period immediately following the solstice the harvesting of barley and the preparation of the threshing floor for the harvest of *far*, *triticum*, and *siligo*,⁵ implying that the chief harvest occurred in July. Turning to Columella,⁶ we find that in temperate places and along the coasts harvesting was completed between July 15 and August 1. Palladius, following Columella, agrees with this rather late date for the harvest of *triticum* in temperate regions, though in another passage he puts it at the end of June for rather warm and dry places along the seacoasts.⁷ Now one might naturally suppose that the region about Rome belonged to the class of warm seacoast localities, and for such the grain harvest would apparently fall not before June 24 and not after the end of July, with the balance of evidence favoring the first half of July.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 29–51. The article is summarized by Oscar Leuze in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, CCXXVII (1930), 137–38.

⁴ *RR* i. 32; Pliny *HN* xviii. 256. 264, and Columella *RR* xi. 2. 49 give *VIII Kal. Iul.* as the first day of the solstice; Columella *ibid.* 53 writes *VII Kal. Aug. Canicula apparet*

⁵ *HN* xviii. 295–98.

⁶ *RR* xi. 2, 53–54.

⁷ viii. 1; vii. 2.

For confirmation one turns to studies of modern Italian agriculture only to receive a rude shock. It seems, according to a report by Girolamo Azzi in the *Nuovi annali del ministro per l'agricoltura*,⁸ that the approximate date for the wheat harvest in the vicinity of Rome is June 13, almost a month earlier than the Romans themselves would lead us to believe. How, then, may we explain this discrepancy? In the first place, Azzi writes that the process of ripening in grain is not only retarded progressively from South to North Italy and from coast to mountains, but is also influenced by local differences in temperature and amount of sunlight and by the humidity of the area, particularly of the soil.⁹ Such a variety of factors might, therefore, account for differences in harvest dates of regions separated by only a few miles. In view of this, it seems only natural that Varro, a native of Reate, should note a later season than Rome's, for this Apennine village lies within a district where grain is now cut about the tenth of July, almost a month later than around Rome. In the same way Pliny's dates agree to a surprising extent with the modern harvest date of June 30 for the district around his own Novum Comum. On the other hand, Columella obviously deals with a colder climate than that of his ancestral estates in Baetica, and it may be that in this case he is choosing what he considers an average period for harvests in Italian coastal regions. This attitude would accord with the greater exactness of his astronomical notes where he gives both the true and the apparent risings of constellations in contrast to the rough guesses of the other ancient Roman agriculturists. Finally, Palladius, a typical compiler, though he might have seen an earlier harvest near his own property in Corsica as well as around Rome, merely gives us a choice between the period set by Varro and the slightly later one of Columella.¹⁰ On the whole, however, it is not strange that these authors should record harvest dates later than Rome's. Theirs were general treatises, not for Rome or Latium, but for all Italy, with frequent references to the provinces. Now the Roman harvest is in no sense a mean date for that of all Italy, but rather one of the earliest in the country. In a list of seventy-eight cities arranged by Azzi in order of priority of harvest dates (Syracuse leading with a harvest on June 1, and at the other extremity Pesco Costanza, where grain is cut September 1), Rome takes eighth place, reaping about June 13.¹¹

⁸ No. 3, 30 Settembre, 1922, "Il clima del grano in Italia," pp. 453-624.

⁹ It is possible that ancient Rome's harvest may have fallen slightly later in June than it does now because of the more humid soil due to greater precipitation in an area once thickly wooded. Cf. Tenney Frank, *An Economic History of Rome* (Baltimore, 1927), pp. 6 and 7; and H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde* (Berlin, 1883), I, 396-97.

¹⁰ Wissowa, though he notes that Columella's dates are about a month in advance of the *Menologia's*, fails to observe that Varro's, Pliny's, and modern Rome's are earlier still.

¹¹ A June harvest for Rome makes the theory of Mannhardt and Fowler (*op. cit.*, pp. 243-44), which Cyril Bailey (in his edition of Ovid's *Fasti*, III, 87) accepts, that the "October equus" sacrifice is the last of a series of harvest festivals, seem quite improba-

Returning at last to the *Menologia rustica*, we find the notice *messes frumentar* not in June or even July but as late as August, nor does this retarded season hold merely for the wheat harvest but for almost every important operation which can be limited to specific dates. For instance, whereas the agriculturalists refer the barley and bean harvest to May or June (and we may suppose that Rome's was at least as early as May),¹² the so-called "rustic"¹³ calendars put this in July. Again, while most ancients and moderns alike agree on late September or October as the usual time for sowing,¹⁴ the calendars point to November. We must conclude, therefore, that the *Menologia rustica* belong to a colder climate than Rome's, and since Pliny tells us that, beyond the Po, wheat was sown in November, it is possible that we should look to North Italy for their origin, or perhaps to a mountainous district in one of the provinces.¹⁵ At all events, they have nothing to do with the times for agricultural work in Rome's neighborhood and, therefore, cannot rightly be used as evidence on questions of early Roman religion.¹⁶

ANNIE LEIGH BROUGHTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

ble; for it would occur four months after the harvest and likewise after the sowing of the next year's crop had started. On the other hand, it might well be a sacrifice to procure a good harvest for the crop just being planted, and Paulus' words (ed. L., p. 246) *id sacrum fiebat ob frugum eventum* suit this explanation too.

¹² Pliny *HN* xviii. 255-57, Colum. *RR* xi. 2, 49-50; Pallad. *RR* vii. 3.

¹³ The term "rustic" or "Bauernkalender" should be used with caution of these calendar altars which, though in part derived from an agricultural source, are obviously artificial products far removed from actual farm life—a fact proved by their elegant material (marble), their sophisticated mathematical calculations, and the omission of most of the truly agricultural festivals such as the Fordicidia, Cerialia, Robigalia, Vinalia, etc. (in a period not later than the first century A.D.).

¹⁴ Varro *RR* i. 34; Pliny *HN* xviii. 49; Colum. *RR* xi. 2, 76-80; but Pallad. *RR* xi. 1 gives a longer period: "a decimo Calendas Novembris ad sextum Idus Decembres regionibus temperatis." Dott. Azzi (*loc. cit.*) puts Rome in the group in which wheat is sown in October.

¹⁵ Pliny *HN* xviii. 205. Cf. also Vergil *Georg.* i. 219-24.

¹⁶ Since coming to this conclusion I have discovered that G. P. E. Huschke, in his *Das alte römische Jahr und seine Tage* (Breslau, 1869), p. 359, also believed that the *Men. rust.* belong to a colder climate than that referred to by the agricultural writers.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die typischen Scenen bei Homer. Von WALTER AREND. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1933. Pp. viii+162+Tafeln 1-9.

There are certain actions which tend to recur in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and which, each time they do recur, are told again with many of the same details and many of the same words. Arend calls such passages "typical scenes," inasmuch as they have a common "type." The greater part of his book is made up of his analysis in turn of the most striking sets of such scenes, namely, those which recount arrival, sacrifice and eating, journeys by sea or land, arming and dressing, sleep, hesitation before decision (*μερμηριζειν*), assembly, oath, and bath. In each case he starts from those passages which are most alike, and shows by charts how nearly they have the same stages of the action in the same order, and how nearly they use the same verses and verse parts. He then goes on to other places where the course of the tale has changed or shortened or lengthened the action, and here he shows how Homer, far from quitting his usual pattern, uses it as the base and framework for scenes which may be even among the most unique in the poems. For example, Arend first fixes (p. 28) the simple type of an arrival scene on the basis of the passages where Athena, at Hera's order, seeks out Odysseus (B167-72), where Nestor and Odysseus go to waken Diomed (K150-58), where Thetis brings Achilles the divine weapons (Σ616-T7), and where Nestor recounts how he and Odysseus had visited the home of Peleus (A769-81). Then taking up again the last two of these passages, he shows for the one (p. 29) how like it is to the other three scenes where Thetis comes to her son (A359-63, Σ65-74, Ω121-27), and for the other (pp. 34-36) how like it is to other scenes where the arrival takes the form of a visit, as when Patroclus calls at the tent of Nestor (A617-47), or when Achilles receives the embassy (I182-223). Finally we see how Priam's visit to the tent of Achilles, for all the uniqueness of its telling, yet follows the pattern of the type (Ω322-484, pp. 37-39). Arend elsewhere brings out the same "typical" treatment in other parts of the story of Hector's ransoming, namely, for Priam's *journey* from Troy to the Achaean camp (Ω189-469, pp. 88-89), for Hermes' *arrival* on the Trojan plain (Ω333-48, pp. 54, 58-61), and for Priam's *eating* in Achilles' tent (Ω625-28, pp. 69-70), and he thus makes plain how Homer builds his tale by joining and interworking the traditional schemes of composition. The book closes with a like analysis of the practice of Apollonius and Virgil, who, however, as later poets, make use of the "typical" only in so far as they set out to copy Homer. Here as elsewhere the analysis is fine and thorough. To some readers it may seem tiresome, but it is chiefly

to those who, like Arend, join to a real feeling for Homer's song the sober work needed to make clear with exactness wherein it differs in form from more modern poetries that we can look for a real advance in Homeric studies.

Yet for all that he so clearly sees the schematization of Homer's composition, Arend fails almost altogether to understand the reasons for it. For this he is not greatly to be blamed, since there is still so little general knowledge of the way in which oral narrative poetry is composed, and it is only with this knowledge that we can understand the very simple reasons why Homer uses a fixed diction and follows a fixed pattern for the telling of his story. Having nothing better, Arend outlines a philosophic and almost mystic theory, to which he seems to have been inspired (cf. p. 2, n. 3) by Nietzsche's oracular utterances about Homer dancing in chains. Arend writes (p. 26), referring to Priam's *journey* from Troy to the battlefield (Γ259-65):

To sum up, the Greek sees right through to the essential, and brings it out in the presentation: the structure, the form, the *εἶδος*. But the essential of an incident is that which is constant in all the repetitions. And therefore this type of *journey by land* can and must recur whenever a like happening comes up.

On the other hand (p. 27):

Yet we find scenes which have almost nothing in common with Γ. But it is just this little bit which counts. What counts is that all the particular cases result either from the toning down or the embellishing of a single type. All the variations, extreme as they may be, especially in the *Odyssey*, yet have not broken down the fixed form. So arises the peculiar and unique nature of the Homeric art, the play between fixed form and varying embellishment (*εἶδος* and *ποιηδία* in the language of the old commentators), between the necessary and the chance, between the typical and the individual, between repetition and variation, and it has preserved for us a picture of the peculiar Greek comprehension of reality, which in manyness saw the one and yet by reason of oneness did not forget the many.

Now all that may or may not be true—it does not matter much, but it is surely simpler to say that Homer relates the same action in more or less the same way because that was the only way he had learned. The singer of tales, unlike the writer of poetry, is never free of his tradition. He has not learned his art from a varied reading, but only from listening to older singers. He has no pen and ink to let him slowly work out a novel way of recounting novel actions, but must make up his tale without pausing, in the speed of his singing. This he can do only by telling each action as it comes up in more or less the usual way, and in more or less the usual verses which go with that way. That there are not many of these ways is because the singers, even as they tended, for reasons of easier verse-making, to keep only the one best and easiest formula for expressing a given idea in a given length of verse, so tended also to keep only a single set of details for a given action. The fixed action-patterns and the fixed formulas, of course, depend on one another: an action which

each time took a new form would call for new words, and in the same way the formulas are useful only inasmuch as the singer uses the schemes of composition in which they are meant to serve.

Arend points out that Homer likes to relate an action from beginning to end, and to treat each principal stage of the action in its proper order. But in this there is nothing strange or particularly Greek. The singer, like anyone who is telling a story aloud, finds it easiest to lead his action straight ahead. Where Homer, however, must have differed from the ordinary singer of his day, was in his being able to tell the action more fully. A highly developed oral poetry differs from one which is less developed because its singers have a more ample art. The song which has only a few hundred verses in the hut of some hard-working tiller of the soil, whose time for such sport is short, will run into thousands of verses when it is sung before some noble by a singer who, raised among men with great leisure for talk and song, has had time to become fully practiced in a highly developed art. The difference between such long and short versions of the same song lies in what singers call the "adornment." The finished singer will boast that he knows "how to saddle a horse," or "dress a hero," or "plan a battle," and whereas one less skilful might spend only a verse or two on these actions, he himself will give twenty or fifty or more verses to them. This great difference is never due in any more than a small part to the singer's own making up things. It comes instead from his having been trained in a richer tradition, and, as a singer of talent, from his having been able to grasp all the richness of the tradition. When asked how he has learned to caparison a horse so well, he will say briefly that as he has heard so he sings. But if one is able to point out that the singer from whom he learned his song has nothing of that sort in his version, he will then say that the other had shortened the song (which among singers is the most rankling of all accusations), and that he himself had known how to put it right. Questioned further, he will explain that bad singers leave this out and leave that out, but a good singer knows how to put it back in, even though he has never heard that particular song. What he means, though never having reasoned about his art he cannot say it, is that he has listened to so many songs and stored away in his mind ready for use such a vast stock of details of heroic action, in the form of the verses and verse parts whereby they are expressed in song, that at no point in his story is he forced to give up telling his story in all its fulness.

It is along such lines as these that Arend might have planned his analysis, not aiming to bring out a meaningless play of norm and variation, but rather to show how Homer, with his overwhelming mastery of the traditional epic stuff, enriches the course of his story now with one group of details, now with another, though each group for a given action will tend to center about certain key verses and to follow a certain general pattern. Happily the theory of "type" and variation is so tenuous a thing that it has had almost no effect at

all upon Arend's analysis itself, which thus remains good. He is also to be praised for going to other early poetries for parallels to Homer's style, though such parallels are likely to be idle when we know as little about how the poetry was really composed as we do for the Assyrian-Babylonian poem of Gilgamesh, which Arend is most fond of citing. The healthy result of this reading of early poems shows itself in his not finding falsely subtle meanings in the repetitions, as meant to recall an earlier scene where the same words are used, and in his forceful refutation of the practice of those older critics who, setting up an unhomeric conciseness as the Homeric standard, threw out at will such repeated passages as did not suit them or their theories.

†MILMAN PARRY

Harvard University

Der Humanismus. VON ENGELBERT DRERUP. ("Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums," Band XIX, Heft 2.) Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1934. Pp. 164. Rm. 7.60.

The subtitle indicates that this is a consideration of "Der Humanismus in seiner Geschichte, seinen Kulturwerten und seiner Vorbereitung im Unterrichtswesen der Griechen." The volume under discussion consists of four lectures, delivered at various places between the years 1917 and 1933. Not a single statement, however, has become antiquated, for both the text and the footnotes have undergone a thorough revision and have been brought strictly up to date. There is no lack of unity in this volume, a defect which commonly marks books that have been made up of a number of originally isolated lectures.

The four lectures, or chapters, bear the following superscriptions: (i) "Perioden der klassischen Philologie"; (ii) "Kulturwerte des Humanismus. Nachtrag: Die Erneuerung des Humanismus"; (iii) "Erziehung und Unterricht im griechischen Altertum"; (iv) "Typen des höheren Unterrichts im griechischen Altertum."

The first lecture is far more than a mere chronological and chorographical survey of classical scholarship; it emphasizes especially the varying emphasis that was placed on the different phases of classical study from time to time and the shifting viewpoint from which this study was approached in the different periods and countries in the ebb and flow of its historical course.

In view of the present-day popularity of studying foreign literatures in translation, it is interesting to note a few lines in Professor Drerup's second lecture (pp. 72-73):

Wer also die klassischen Sprachen und insbesondere das Griechische als Unterrichtsgegenstand der höheren Schulen ausmerzen will, beraubt unser Volk auch des unentbehrlichsten Hilfsmittels zum Verständnis der eigenen literarischen Blü-

† Deceased.

tezeit, die vor allem vom Borne des klassischen Altertums getränkt worden ist. . . . Wer aber durch blosse Übersetzungen antiker Literaturwerke dieses Verständnis glaubt sich erobern zu können, handelt etwa wie ein Kunstwissenschaftler, der aus Stahlstichen den Farbenschmelz eines Perugino und Raffael auf sich wirken lassen möchte, um danach die modernen Präraffaeliten zu beurteilen. Mit Recht hat ein geistreiches Wort Übersetzungen als die Zinsen eines Kapitals bezeichnet, das im Bildungsschatze eines Volkes bestehen bleiben muss, wenn anders nicht die Zinsen verloren gehen sollen.

It is a strange phenomenon that students of comparative literature rarely recognize the fact that translations generally are just that, namely, translations and not literature.

In the third lecture, which deals with Greek education through Hellenistic times, there appears the following statement, which merits the wholehearted acclaim of those of us who can see through and beyond the pretense and prattle of our colleagues in the school of education: "In der Tat gibt es kaum einen Grundgedanken der modernen pädagogischen Wissenschaft, den nicht das Griechentum vorweggenommen und in eigenartigen praktischen Schöpfungen durchgeführt hat" (p. 90). In the fourth lecture Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle stand out as the pedagogical trinity whose achievements have determined the course of higher education among the cultured nations of the world to the present day.

This volume, packed with information and learning, defies the preparation of a summary; it must be read, or rather, studied. In this day of narrow specialization it is refreshing to find a scholar who is conversant with all the major fields of classical study in all periods: language, literature, art, and archaeology. Inscriptions and papyri, the giants, sham giants, and real pygmies of literature, are all equally within the author's easy grasp. It has been my privilege and my pleasure to review some of Professor Drerup's works and to read many more, with the result that my admiration for both the depth and the breadth of his scholarship has increased with the appearance of each new publication.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. X: *The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.-A.D. 70*. Edited by S. A. COOK, Litt.D., F.B.A.; F. E. ADcock, M.A.; and M. P. CHARLESWORTH, M.A. New York: Macmillan Co.; Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Pp. xxxii+1058 and maps and tables. \$11.

The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. IV of Plates. Prepared by C. T. SELTMAN, M.A. New York: Macmillan Co.; Cambridge: University Press, 1934. Pp. xiv+211. \$4.00.

The American edition of these two volumes actually appeared in January, 1935. They have received a deservedly warm welcome and will be used with

profit for many years to come. Volume X begins in 44 B.C. and carries the narrative history through the reign of Nero and the succeeding period of civil war and rebellions. The Augustan age is treated in considerable detail. After chapters not only on the narrative history but also on the government, administration, military system, frontiers, economic development, social conditions, religion, literature, and art of the period, the section is unified and brought to a fitting close by Adcock's penetrating chapter on "The Achievement of Augustus," which ends on page 606. Though a few of the earlier chapters carry their problems beyond the reign of Augustus, this section forms a well-integrated whole. In the later chapters no attempt is made to cover all phases of the period after Augustus. Naturally several topics, notably the survey of the provinces, are put off to the next volume.

The volume of plates supplies illustrations with comment for the text of Volumes IX and X. The work of preparing the plates has been well done and was begun early enough to make it possible to insert references to the plates throughout Volume IX (published 1932). In addition to the mass of material presented for the study of Roman art and architecture, the Parthians are well represented, while the coins are of interest in connection with many a knotty problem of history. The plates are excellent and the descriptive material extremely useful.

To return to Volume X, in the first four chapters (126 pp.) Charlesworth and Tarn give a brilliant account of the period of civil wars leading to the final establishment of Augustus. The line of division in the main is such as to make Charlesworth responsible for the West and Tarn for the East. It is too much to hope that all details of the interpretation of so difficult a period will be acceptable to all, but every reader will find that both authors have an unusual gift of interesting presentation and penetrating judgment, that their work is perfectly integrated, and that an effort has been made to give a sympathetic statement of the ideals and points of view of all parties. Both authors also possess the ability to say much with a few words. As examples may be quoted the remark of Charlesworth apropos of the exactions of Brutus and Cassius in Asia, "It was the last expiring act of old Republican brutality, but it supplied the sinews of war" (p. 23), and the following statement by Tarn concerning Cleopatra: "Rome, who had never condescended to fear any nation or people, did in her time fear two human beings; one was Hannibal, and the other was a woman" (p. 111).

When the story of the triumph of Octavian has been completed, there begins a more specialized account of phases of the government and culture of the Augustan age. The rôles of the *princeps* and of the senate and people are discussed in two chapters by Sir Henry Stuart Jones. The details of imperial administration and of the organization of the army and navy are described by G. H. Stevenson. Next come four chapters devoted to frontiers and sections of the Empire. The eastern frontier is discussed by J. G. C. Anderson;

the northern, by Ronald Syme; while special chapters on Egypt and Judaea are contributed by W. Idris Bell and A. Momigliano respectively. This is followed by chapters on the economic development by F. Oertel, the social policy of Augustus by Hugh Last, religion by A. D. Nock, literature by T. R. Glover, and art by Mrs. Strong. These, in turn, are followed by the chapter by Adcock, already noted. The accounts of the reigns of the later emperors are by Charlesworth (Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius), Momigliano (Nero), and Stevenson (Galba, Otho, and Vitellius). The problems of the eastern frontier during the period are again discussed by Anderson, while the northern frontier is divided between Syme and R. G. Collingwood. The latter, naturally, contributes the section on Britain. The last chapter of the volume on "Rebellion within the Empire" is the work of Stevenson (Gaul) and Momigliano (Palestine).

Such a list of contributors is in itself a guaranty that the task is well done. As a whole, the general tone is one of moderation and avoidance of extremes and sensationalism. It will be impossible to criticize so complicated a work in detail. Consequently only a few points will be noted. Since it is easy for students to picture the institutions of the Roman Empire as more uniform than they actually were, it is a pleasure to note that Stevenson, in connection with the Augustan age remarks that the Romans "were too wise to impose the municipal system on regions accustomed to a different kind of organization" (p. 208). His illustrations are taken from western provinces. Could not this be amplified by means of further illustrations taken from the East? Similarly Stevenson observes (p. 210) that "by no means every province possessed a . . . centre of worship (of the Emperor) before the death of Augustus," while Nock (p. 486) after telling about the cults at Lugdunum and Oppidum Ubiorum states: "Elsewhere in the West development was gradual and spontaneous." This is undoubtedly correct. Where the ruler cult was created by Rome, it was created "as an instrument for the spreading of her culture." The Roman policy with regard to the Gauls is interpreted in slightly different ways by Adcock and Stevenson. According to Adcock "Rome offered to them a sense of national unity within the Empire" (p. 585), while according to Stevenson Rome "was not anxious to create a sense of national unity, which under able leaders might have been a source of danger to herself" (p. 841). To be sure, Rome did not desire a national unity of a type that would prove dangerous. Yet Adcock's statement contains more truth, for the point is that Rome offered the Gauls "a sense of national unity" through the instrumentality of an institution through which they at the same time expressed their loyalty to Rome. Another side of the activities of the provincial assemblies is noticed in the following statement by Charlesworth concerning Tiberius: "There is evidence to suggest that he encouraged the provincial assemblies to act as organs for public opinion and forward complaints or instigate prosecutions" (p. 650). Some further opportunities to illustrate the im-

portance of provincial assemblies are missed. Hirschfeld (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 132) has suggested that it was the Assembly of the Three Gauls that appealed to Claudius in the famous case of the *ius honorum* of the Gauls. Though this theory involves many difficulties and has won few converts, it has much in its favor. Another omission involves more simple material. The speech of Thrasea Paetus reported in Tac. *Ann.* xv. 20–21 and the incident with which it is connected clearly show that the activities of provincial assemblies were considerable also under Nero. These omissions are by no means surprising when it is remembered how difficult the subject is and further that no one of the contributors to the present volume has been called upon to give a special account of the subject. Such an account would belong properly to a later volume.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Comparative Greek and Latin Syntax. By R. W. MOORE. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1934. Pp. x+224. 6s.

Let it be said at the outset that this book is being used in my course on the "History of Greek and Latin." It is a good basis for the discussion of problems in the historical and comparative syntax of the two languages—as a whipping post, I mean. Shades of Delbrück! A man need not consider himself irremediably and eternally damned—the Almighty cannot have intended that—if he happens not to be what it is the fashion to call a "productive scholar." But any man who presumes to write and to have published a book should at least have the decency first to know and to try to understand what his superiors have done already in his chosen field. Delbrück's writings are meat for grown men; Mr. Moore writes for schoolboys and undergraduates, but it is hard to see why he should have written, or his publisher have published, this book, even for them. This milk and water, diluted for babes and sucklings, is poisoned at its source. That the well of comparative philology in my native land is drying up in a desert of ignorance even of the would-be critic, his milk of human kindness poisoned by rancor, is made manifest when a chartered Zoilus is permitted to pursue his peculiar course in criticisms full of half-truths that belittle a work like Hirt's *Indogermanische Grammatik* by picking holes and ignoring the real object and intrinsic merits of the book.¹ No wonder that the product of this school is a compound of half-understood comparative grammar and of outmoded theory.

I say nothing of the English "who are you talking to?" (sic), page 5.² But the whole of pages 1 to 3, and statements about "the natural growth" of language (p. 6), about a language reaching its "maturity" (p. 13), and above all

¹ E.g., *Class. Rev.*, XLIII (1929), 25 f.

² This expression is said to be vocative!

the absurd falsehood that "languages in their earlier times have more cases than they use in their later days when they have reached maturity" (p. 4)—what about modern Caucasian dialects with twenty-four cases, Finnish with fifteen, and Hungarian with twenty-one, or the easily observable development of the cases within the history of pro-ethnic Indo-European itself?—bewray an ignorance of the history of human speech and of the nature of all articulate expression that is at once colossal and childish. Anything more muddle-headed than the discussion of the accusative case, which begins with a feeble attempt (p. 11) to distinguish between the accusative of the effect and the accusative of the affect that is straightway forgotten would be hard to imagine. There is more than one place (pp. 8, 22) where the old nonsense about the imitation of Greek syntax in Latin is repeated. Did then the Atiedian priests of Iguvium imitate Greek syntax in their Umbrian ritual when they construed an accusative with a verb in the "passive" voice? These general criticisms can be justified in detail. I take a few specimens, out of many, that illustrate the deficiencies of the whole discussion of the noun.

Page 7 (cf. pp. 16, 20): The nominative absolute is wrongly classified, after the rules of antediluvian grammar, as (1) nominative in apposition, (2) accusative of description, and (3) accusative absolute.

Page 11: For adverbial read adverb.

Page 25 (cf. pp. 35, 37, 45, 47): Here the genitive of the sphere (whether total or partial), cf. $\theta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ 'Aθavalas (IG, IV, 554), is passed over in complete silence, as if the author had never heard of it. It is, however, the one key to any understanding of the genitive.

Page 45 (cf. p. 49): The utterly false label "metaphorical ablative" is attached to the real simon-pure instrumental. On page 53 (where the instrumental is discussed) there is not a word about the important prosecutive use of that case (as in *recta regione uiai*, Lucr. ii. 249).

Page 48: A more informed account of equative constructions would have rescued the reader from the puzzlement in which this "explanation" of *melior est quam Traianus* leaves him.

Page 49: Here $\chi\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ is actually called an old locative form! Does not Mr. Moore know that it is dative (cf. *it clamor caelo*) or that the only Indo-European case ending for the locative singular is *-i*, recent heresy notwithstanding?

The discussion of the verb is no better.

Page 70: This account of the passive voice misses entirely the root of the matter, namely the substitution of a grammatical subject for the psychological subject. "He was killed" tells you far less than "Mrs. Maybrick killed him"—even if murder will out.

Page 73: The historic present gives "greater vividness." That hoary chestnut! Whose heart ever leaps up when he beholds the historic present? Ninety-nine times out of a hundred the so-called "historic" present in Greek and

Latin is annalistic, a fragment torn from annals which (like modern diarists) used the present.

Page 81 (cf. p. 84): The optative is a "remoter form" of the subjunctive. This taradiddle is just so many words divorced from thought. Why does Thucydides vary the mood at ii. 3. 4 (*προσφέρουσιν* [so rightly the Oxford text] . . . *γίγνονται*), cf. iii. 22. 8 (*ἢ . . . βοηθοῖεν*)? Not because the optative expressed the remoter consequence, the subjunctive the more immediate. Such an explanation is absurd at Herodotus i. 185 (*ἐποίησε δὲ . . . ταῦτα ὡς ὃ τε ποταμὸς βραδύτερος εἶη . . . καὶ οἱ πλοῖα ἕωςι σκολλοῖ*), where the order is especially interesting and in complete contrast with that in the second place cited from Thucydides (cf. ii. 5. 4). The more immediate consequence is, in fact, *βραδύτερος εἶη* (in the optative), but the reason given by, or conceived in the mind of, him who *ἐποίησε ταῦτα* is the more remote *ὡς πλοῖα ἕωςι σκολλοῖ*. In modern style, marks of quotation are used to express just the meaning which the historian intends to convey by the subjunctive, but there is no necessary relation between that which is uttered (or consciously realized) and "more remote" intent or consequence, on the one hand, or between that which is merely implicit and the "more immediate," on the other. A person may clearly conceive or utter only the more remote purpose on consequence; the more immediate may be left to be implied, or it may be added by the historian by way of comment (see Goodwin, who had the right of the matter, *MT* §318). The subjunctive then is, as it were, a quotation of the subject's actual words or thought; the optative states the implicit motive or merely the writer's summary or estimate of it. But which expresses the more immediate and which the more remote consequence depends on the facts of the situation and has nothing to do with the choice of mood or, what comes to the same thing, with the choice of which intent is to be represented as having been explicitly formulated and which not.

Page 85: Delete the mark of interrogation after *ἀλλ' οἷσθ' ὁ δῖος*. Properly, an imperative of the form of *δῖος* is either an infinitive used as imperative (Brugmann), like *λῦσαι*, or a gerundive (with *-σον* from *-τῆσθαι* beside *-τέον* from *-τῆσθαι*).

Page 90: The reader is told that the Latin gerund is "in form" a "passive verbal adjective," but "active in sense"! This is like saying that milk is black in appearance, but white in substance. The gerund is active in both form and meaning. How could it be other? A form is nothing but a recurrent vocal feature with a corresponding meaning. And the gerund is not an adjective. It is merely an accident that the Latin gerund and gerundive became partially alike in outward shape; so in modern (but not in old or early middle) English the present participle and the gerund have come to be alike in form, but they were originally distinct.

It may be said that comparative philology is not for the schoolboy. But pedagogy and its traditional instruction do not justify error; and even if ease

of publication now makes the old confusion worse confounded, yet the scientific study of syntax is not too hard even for schoolboys. I commend to them, and to Mr. Moore, Kroll's *Wissenschaftliche Syntax im Lateinischen* and Sommer's *Vergleichende Syntax der Schulsprachen*.

J. WHATMOUGH

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Pausanias, Description of Greece. With an English translation by W. H. S. JONES. ("Loeb Classical Library," Nos. 272, 297, 298.) Vols. III-IV, 1933 and 1935; Vol. V (*Companion Volume, Containing Illustrations and Index*, prepared by R. E. WYCHERLY), 1935. London: Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

The first volume of this edition of Pausanias appeared in 1918. If the interval between that date and 1935 seem somewhat long, it is amply excused by four Loeb volumes of Hippokrates, for which Mr. Jones is chiefly responsible. Pausanias and Hippokrates are not closely allied authors; and, when one recalls Mr. Jones's books on ancient malaria, one might suspect that he, like the Platonist who first translated Pausanias into English, would find the author somewhat "out of his track." But Mr. Jones's track is broad, including Latin textbooks and a book on Greek morality in relation to institutions. He is even announced as the Loeb translator of Pliny's *Natural History*.

In vi. 2. 1, Pausanias wrote Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . . διετέθησαν πάντων φιλοτιμότατα Ἑλλήνων πρὸς ἵππων τροφάς. Frazer translates: "The Lacedaemonians were keener breeders of horses than all the rest of the Greeks." Jones: "The Lacedaemonians became keener breeders of horses than any other Greeks." The phrase common to the two translations does not appear to be inevitably required by the Greek; indeed it is a little misleading. This passage is quoted because it is adapted to brief quotation; but there are others, in considerable number, that suggest a rather special use of Frazer. The coincidences are so noticeable that one may approach with some apprehension the passages in which the translators work from different texts. Such apprehensions prove to be unfounded. Jones translated his own text, and a few good notes on obscure passages indicate that his work was done by no means inattentively. Furthermore, the differences between Jones and Frazer are usually in favor of Jones. Often he is more exact, as in the aorist of the passage quoted; when he cannot be more exact, he is likely to be a little freer; seldom if ever is he less clear or less readable. Questions of actual correctness hardly arise.

"The text of Spiro has rarely been altered." This, in the first volume, is the only statement in regard to the constitution of the text. In at least one instance (vii. 26. 10) the reading printed appears to be Jones's own; it is not strikingly meritorious, and in a note Spiro's suggestion is preferred. There are a number of critical notes, which usually record deviations not from Spiro

but from the manuscripts. These notes are scarcely sufficient to be of much use to serious students of the text, and few of them will interest anyone else. In v. 17. 4 Καλχηδόσιος is printed, with no note to warn that all MSS have Καρχηδόσιος. The emendation was reasonably considered nearly certain some years ago, but since 1912 (*Jh. Oest. Arch. I.* [1912], *Beiblatt* 208) it has been only a bare possibility. On the other hand, in vi. 6. 1 he follows the manuscripts in reading Ναυκίδαν; it is possible that he is right, but Θαυκίδαν is considerably more probable (cf. *Jb. Arch. I.* [1920], p. 67). In the description of the great altar at Olympia (v. 13. 9) he follows Spiro in adopting Trendelenburg's emendation without any note and without evident consciousness of the archaeological problem involved. Pausanias cannot be edited by paleography alone.

Explanatory notes to the translation are few. One of them (x. 9. 6) is unfortunately worded, implying that Tegeans were not Arcadians. In general the notes are good, but scanty. When Pausanias cites an author, the exact reference is given in a note, and the dates of important historical events are given; otherwise there is little to help the reader. Presumably the translator felt that it was out of the question to print all that would be relevant and, so, that he might as well print nothing or almost nothing. The notes in Granger's *Vitruvius* show that it is possible to give a great deal of useful information in little space.

The *Companion Volume* is the work of Mr. Wycherly. According to the legend on the dust cover, it is translated by him; evidently no responsible person took the trouble to glance at the jacket. The first twenty-eight plates are maps or plans; the last, No. 85, contains drawn restorations of the Chest of Kypselos and the Olympia pediments; the rest are photographs—three of these show coins. The separation of plans from photographs is regrettable. The maps, showing Pausanias' routes, will be welcome to the reader. The illustrations are well chosen, though Treu's version of the east gable at Olympia hardly deserves the preference now, and Aigosthaina surely is more notable than Tithorea. Most of the photographs are good; better could have been found for the Tomb at Orchomenos (Pl. 69) and Lake Stymphalos (Pl. 63b), and a picture made from a considerably greater distance might well have replaced Plate 31. In Plate 48 something to show the scale would be desirable. Plate 76, the two omphaloi at Delphi, is new and excellent. The plan of the agora at Athens (Pl. 12) was very up to date last year; it has already ceased to be so, but is permanently useful since it contains the essential topographical features of the west side.

The commentary is unpretentious, but a great deal of thought and care evidently went into it. Dinsmoor's discoveries at Bassai apparently came too late to be used. On pages 37 and 104 there are errors in stating directions. Some of the Nike parapet was easy enough to see (p. 30). "Well," taken over from the translation, is a poor word for Glauke and for κρηγή in general. The

Hermes is treated as an original by Praxiteles, the Agias as a copy from Lysippos; of these conservative views the first is right, the second probably wrong. For the purposes of the Loeb Library would not dimensions in feet be better than those in meters? It is hardly true that Greek military architecture had reached its height in the fourth century; military architecture is not merely a matter of good masonry.

There is a very brief Bibliography, from which Pomtow's Pauly-Wissowa article on Delphi might have been eliminated in favor of Weller's *Athens*. Also there is a General Index and an Index of Artists. I note that Daidalos "of Athens" is present in both, Daidalos of Sikyon entirely absent; but both indexes seem to be excellent. In them, as elsewhere in the volume, there are hundreds of perfectly useless paragraph signs. The references, of course, use the numbers of the books, and it is unfortunate that these do not appear at the tops of pages in the other volumes. On the whole the volume is a good job. Some users will regret that its contents were not distributed among the volumes of text, but there are some advantages in having them all together.

All kinds of specialists consult Pausanias, but few people read him much. What congressman is ignorant of Thucydides' prophecy on the Echinades, and of how it proved false? Yet Pausanias' explanation of the matter has not been mentioned, I think, in the discussions of soil erosion. A Loeb edition should increase the circulation of any author; perhaps the periegete's varied lore will now reach a wider public.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

Le mura di Roma repubblicana, saggio di archeologia. By GÖSTA SÄFLUND. ("Skifter Utguina av Svenska Institutet i Rom," Vol. I.). Lund: Gleerup; London: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. v+278 with 28 pls. and 72 figs. in text.

If Dr. Säflund in his monograph entitled "*Le mura di Roma repubblicana*" had done nothing more than assemble the mass of material pertaining to the so-called Servian wall, he would have performed a great service to archaeology. Not only has he analyzed for material, dimensions, and surface markings every stone left in the wall or found in the vicinity, but he has diligently read the ancient authors for allusions and pertinent facts and studied the literature of excavations for further information. He has even examined and reproduced sketches from Lanciani's notebook. Only those who have attempted archaeological tasks of similar magnitude in Rome can really appreciate the vast amount of labor expended upon the first of the three parts which compose the volume. In the second part he develops with painstaking care his theory of the defense of the city from the historical-archaeological point of view and in the third he interprets the existing remains from this standpoint. A brief summary follows:

Before the time of Servius Tullius each hill had its own defense. Servius Tullius built an *agger* and a *fossa* from the Porta Collina to the Porta Esquilina for an added protection to those who dwelt on the hills, feeling no concern for the inhabitants of the valleys. Traces of this *agger* have come to light from time to time. The Gallic invasion of 390 B.C. showed the inadequacy of this defense; the Syracusan attack on the coast of Etruria in 384 may have given an added warning, although Syracuse was friendly disposed to Rome. Meanwhile Rome by her conquest of Veii in 396 had shown herself a rising power in the Western Mediterranean whom Syracuse wished to serve as a bulwark between her and her enemy, Etruria. Therefore Syracuse, by now experienced in the art of wall-building, sent engineers and workmen to help Rome with her problem of defense. Quarries opened up in the vicinity of Veii furnished the *grotta oscura tufa* of which this first cut-stone wall was built. Sicilian Greeks cut the stone and marked the pieces with letters from the Syracusan-Selinuntine form of the Greek alphabet so as to receive their pay for the work accomplished. Syracusan engineers were undoubtedly responsible for the inclusion of the Aventine, since they would see the importance of controlling the food supply brought by way of the Tiber as the Romans, who were largely an agricultural people, could not. This was the wall of 378 mentioned by Livy.

With this fortification, Rome was adequately protected from all her enemies. Gradually, however, the efficacy of the old wall was destroyed by the growth of the city. Still, military outposts diminished the danger of actual attack on the city so that the walls were left substantially as they were until Sulla's march on Rome in 88 B.C. gave cause for fresh alarm. There were, however, rather extensive repairs in Fidenae *tufa*, effected long enough after the building of the earlier wall for the *grotta oscura tufa* to have revealed its susceptibility to corrosion. The success of Hannibal at Trasimene would have been a logical time for looking to the defense of the city. The speed with which the walls were repaired in 87 led to the use of *cappellaccio* as well as Monte Verde and Anio *tufa*. The confusion of 43 B.C. may account for further repairs in Gabine stone. Such is Dr. Säf Lund's conjectural history of the vicissitudes of the "Servian" wall.

Incidentally, the monograph has a wealth of up-to-date information for teachers of Roman topography and monuments. It is equally valuable as a running commentary on Livy. The photographs in the text are excellent. They would be more impressive if they had been reproduced in plates, but that would involve unnecessary expense. A general sketch-map in the front, showing the wall in its various phases, frequent diagrams in the text, and twenty-eight plates full of plans, are an invaluable aid to such scholars as enjoy following an argument step by step. Excellent indexes convert the volume into a veritable reference book. Like all scholarly productions, it is well documented. A slightly Swedish idiom perceptible in the Italian makes

the volume slow reading for one whose native tongue is English. It more than repays the attention necessary. However much scholars may disagree as to the details of the interpretation, Dr. Säflund's monograph will long remain the authoritative work on the Servian wall.

MARION E. BLAKE

Sweet Briar College

The Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship. ("Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization," No. 13.) By CALVIN W. McEWAN. University of Chicago Press, 1934. Pp. xii+34. \$1.00.

This work, after a somewhat schematic account of the origin of kingship, gives a useful conspectus of divine kingship in the various oriental cultures. We should welcome a more definite attempt to determine what the evidence means in relation to the conceptions current of divinity and worship, but the data are useful. When the writer passes to Hellenistic monarchy and tries to prove borrowing from oriental precedents, his discussions seem to me to suffer from his failure to do justice to the variety of relationships existing between the Diadochi and the different groupings of men under their power, and to the diverse and tentative forms of ruler worship as it took shape. The Appendix on the title "king of kings" is serviceable.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

Harvard University

Arnobii adversus nationes libri vii. Recensuit C. MARCHESI. ("Corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum," No. 62.) Torino: I. B. Paravia, 1934. Pp. x+435. L. 28.

In the *Rivista di filologia* for December, 1932 (N.S. X, 485-96), Concetto Marchesi, of the University of Pisa, in an article entitled "Per una nuova edizione di Arnobio," stated that, since Reifferscheid's edition of Arnobius was almost exhausted, he would offer certain useful information to the future editor of Arnobius. His conclusions were based upon a careful study of photographs of the Paris manuscript (Bib. Nat. 1661), the sole source for the text of Arnobius, since a manuscript at Brussels is only a transcript of the one at Paris. His noteworthy studies in Arnobius have made him the logical editor of this new edition.

Because of the many difficulties in Arnobius, many critics have studied the text since the last edition appeared in 1873. Marchesi has noted many of these studies in his Preface and in the *apparatus criticus*. He confesses that he has not examined the works of some five writers whom he lists. Arnobius is so rarely edited that it is unfortunate that he did not digest these titles, which he only mentions. The spelling of the author of one of these, Wassenberg, is incorrect. In this list is included the work of Hidén, whose essay on

the Magna Mater of Pessinus, discussed by Arnobius in vii. 49-51, finds no mention in the notes on this passage in Marchesi's edition, although he does cite the work of Kirschwing and Meiser on this point. Hidén's paper, "Von der Grossenmutter bei Arnobius," is more recent than either of these and specifically discusses Meiser's views.

The universal criticism leveled at the *editio princeps* by subsequent editors, *scalet erroribus*, cannot be made of this edition, for this has been very carefully prepared. The general editors of the "Corpus Paravianum," C. Pascal and L. Castiglioni, have themselves made studies of Arnobius, although the latter's critical work has not been published before the present edition.

KEVIN GUINAGH

Eastern Illinois State Teachers College

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ALTHEIM, FRANZ. *Weltherrschaft und Krise*. Frankfurt am Main: V. Klostermann, 1935. Pp. 336. Rm. 10; geb. Rm. 12.50.
- BARBER, G. L. *The Historian Ephorus*. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1935. Pp. xii+190. \$2.50.
- BASORE, JOHN W. (trans.). *Seneca: Moral Essays*, Vol. III. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University; London: W. Heinemann, 1935. Pp. viii+532.
- CLARK, K. W. *The Meaning of ἐλεγκτικός and καταγκτικός in the New Testament*. (Reprinted from *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIV, Part II [1935], 93-101.)
- COSTER, C. H. *The Iudicium Quinquevirale*. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1935. Pp. viii+87. \$2.25.
- ERIKSSON, NILS. *Religiositet och Irreligiositet hos Tacitus: Mit deutscher Zusammenfassung*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1935. Pp. 74. Kr. 2.50.
- European Civilization: Its Origin and Development*. By various contributors, under the direction of EDWARD EYRE. Vol. I: *Prehistoric Man and Earliest Known Societies* (reissue), pp. x+844, Maps 19, \$8.75; Vol. II: *Rome and Christendom*, pp. viii+696, Maps 9, Figs. 14, \$5.25. New York: Oxford University, 1935. Vol. IV: *The Reformation*, pp. 754, \$5.50. New York: Oxford University, 1936.
- GADAMER, H. G. *Plato und die Dichter*. Frankfurt am Main: V. Klostermann, 1934. Pp. 36. Rm. 1.75.
- GAGÉ, JEAN. *Res gestae divi Augusti, ex monumentis Ancyrano et Antiocheno latinis, Ancyrano et Apolloniensi graecis. Texte établi et commenté (avec un Appendice et 4 Planches Hors-Texte)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1935. Pp. 210. Fr. 25.
- GOODFELLOW, CHARLOTTE E. *Roman Citizenship: A Study of Its Territorial and Numerical Expansion from the Earliest Times to the Death of Augustus*. (Dissertation.) Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press, 1935. Pp. 124.
- GOTSMICH, ALOIS. *Probleme der Frühgriechischen Plastik*. Prag: A. O. Czerny, 1935. Pp. 121. Figs. 6.
- HEIDEL, W. A. *Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus, Book II*. ("Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences," XVIII, Part II, 53-134.) Boston: Academy, 1935.
- Hippokrates über Entstehung und Aufbau des menschlichen Körpers (περί σαρκῶν): In Gemeinschaft mit den Mitgliedern des philologischen Proseminars Berlin herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von KARL DEICHGRÄBER, mit einem sprachwissenschaftlichen Beitrag von EDUARD SCHWYZER*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1935. Pp. xviii+97. Rm. 6.50; geb. Rm. 7.50.
- KORNEMANN, ERNST. *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I. von Aegypten: Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1935. Pp. vi+267. Rm. 10; geb. Rm. 12.
- MEYERSTEIN, E. H. W. *The Elegies of Propertius: Done into English Verse*. London: Oxford University, 1935. Pp. xvi+194. \$3.00.
- MOSS, H. ST. L. B. *The Birth of the Middle Ages, 395-814*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. xviii+291. \$5.00.

- OLDFATHER, C. H. (trans.). *Diodorus of Sicily, Books ii (cont.)*. 35-iv. 58, Vol. II ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University; London: W. Heinemann, 1935. Pp. x+540.
- PACK, ROGER A. *Studies in Libanius and Antiochene Society under Theodosius*. (Dissertation.) Menasha, Wis.: George Banta, 1935. Pp. xii+126.
- PARKER, H. M. D. *A History of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337*. London: Methuen, 1935. Pp. xii+402, Maps 4. 15s.
- ROBINSON, RODNEY P. *The Germania of Tacitus: A Critical Edition*. Middletown, Conn.: American Philological Association, 1935. Pp. xiv+338.
- ROLFE, J. C. (trans.). *Ammianus Marcellinus*, Vol. I. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University; London: W. Heinemann, 1935. Pp. 1+583.
- SCHÜTZE, KURT. *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Phänomene Arats*. (Dissertation.) Dresden: M. Dittert, 1935. Pp. 55.
- SEEL, OTTO. *Hirtius: Untersuchungen über die pseudocaesarischen Bella und den Balbusbrief*. ("Klio: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte," N.F., Beiheft 22.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Pp. 115. Rm. 6.50; geb. Rm. 8.
- SMERTENKO, CLARA M., and BELKNAP, GEORGE N. *Studies in Greek Religion*. ("University of Oregon Publications," Vol. V, No. 1.) Eugene: University of Oregon, 1935. Pp. 61. \$0.50.
- STRZELECKI, L. *De Naeviano belli Punici carmine quaestiones selectae*. Kraków: Gebethner & Wolff, 1935. Pp. 40.
- Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. 14. Osloae: A. W. Brügger, 1935. Pp. 137.
- TERZAGHI, N. *Storia della letteratura latina*, Vol. I: *Dalle origini ad Augusto*, pp. viii+484, L. 16; Vol. II: *Da Tiberio al VI secolo*, pp. 332, L. 14. Torino: G. B. Paravia, 1935.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae epigraphicae* (*The Olcott Dictionary of the Latin Inscriptions*), Vol. II: Fasc. 1, *asturica-audio*, pp. 24; Fasc. 2, *audio-augur*, pp. 25-48. By L. F. SMITH, J. H. McLEAN, and C. W. KEYES. New York: Columbia University, 1935. \$0.75 per fasc.
- VINCE, J. H. (trans.). *Demosthenes: Against Meidias, Androktion, Aristocrates, Timocrates, Aristogeiton*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University, 1935. Pp. viii+598.
- VOGT, J. *Ciceros Glaube an Rom*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935. Pp. 101. Rm. 4.50.
- Yale Classical Studies*. Vol. V. New Haven: Yale University, 1935. Pp. 304, Pls. 3, Figs. 85. \$3.00.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1935*. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith, 1935. Pp. xii+103. 3s. 6d.
- WENDEL, C. (ed.). *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1935. Pp. xxviii+402. Rm. 20; geb. Rm. 22.
- WINSPEAR, A. D., and GEWEKE, L. K. *Augustus and the Reconstruction of Roman Government and Society*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1935. Pp. 317.
- ZULUTA, F. DE. *Supplements to the Institutes of Gaius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. 12. \$0.50.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXI

- A Biography of the Greek People*, Lavell 272
- A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, Raby 264
- A Survey of Classical Roman Literature*, Lockwood 188
- action, continuity of, in Plautus, discussed 244
- administrative commissions, and official career, 218-167 B.C. 23
- adverbs, temporal, in Plautus 251 f.
- agriculture, modern Italian, and Varro *et al.*, on harvest dates 355
- Alcmaeonidae, scandals about, possible origin of 44
- aliens, delinquent, at Athens 341
- ἀμύχανος, as epithet of Jason 167
- Ancient Textiles from Egypt in the University of Michigan Collection*, Wilson 93
- Anth. App. Plan.* (xvi). 54. 2, discussed 261
- Antipater of Sidon, influence of 234
- Anyte, discussed 231
- ἀπέρταιροι, at Gortyn, discussed 18 f.
- ἀποστόλιον, in tariff of Coptos 152 f.
- Archias, of Antioch, poems of 238; of Byzantium 236; of Mytilene 232, 240 f.; Younger 238
- Archidamian War, propaganda in 33
- Argonautica*, of Valerius Flaccus 53
- Aristophanes *Pax* 602-11, as possible propaganda 43
- army, Trojan, position of, discussed 302 f.
- Arnobii adversus nationes libri vii*, ed. Marchesi 371
- Arrian, Vol. II, trans. Robson 270
- Ars poetica*, date of 163
- Asclepiades, discussed 241
- Athens, imprisonment in 338
- Bacchylidis Carmina cum fragmentis*, post Fridericum Blass et Guilelmum Suess, ed. Snell 268
- βασιλεὺς, in New Comedy, Fraenkel's view of, discussed 62 ff.
- books received 95, 191, 287, 373
- bow of Odysseus 168
- Caesar's narrative style, development of 212
- Cicero: "The Verrine Orations," Part II, Books iii, iv, and v, trans. Greenwood 285
- Cicéron, correspondance, Tome I, ed. and trans. Constans 77
- Cleomenes' desecration of grove of Argus, discussed 50 ff.
- Cnossus, perioeci of 19
- Codices Latini antiquiores*, Part I: "The Vatican City," ed. Lowe 170
- comedy, Roman, silent rôles in 97
- Comitium, Ruminal fig tree in, 307 ff.
- Comparative Greek and Latin Syntax*, Moore 364
- compensation, law of, in Plautus 332
- Contexts in Pindar with Reference to the Meaning of φέρτος*, Lyde 267
- continuity of time, in Plautus 244
- cooks as supernumeraries, in Roman comedy 104 ff.
- co-ordination, in Caesar's style 219 f.
- Coreyra, destruction of oligarchs at, discussed 50 ff.
- corporal penalty, at Athens, meaning of 340
- Corpus vasorum antiquorum*, eds. Robinson and McGehee 187
- Crete, perioeci in 11
- cultus deum* (*Argonautica* i. 15), meaning of 56
- customs declarations, discussed 154 ff.
- Das Augusteisch-Hadrianische Armee-reglement und Vegetius 1

- date, of *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus **53**; of *Ars poetica* **163**
- debtors, state, at Athens, liability of **339 f.**
- dedication, in *Ars poetica*, discussed **165 f.**
- Der Humanismus*, Drerup **360**
- description, as feature of Caesar's style **223**
- dialectics, in early Roman dramatists **322**
- Die Geographie des Homerischen Epos*, Hennig **85**
- Die Literatur der Römer bis zur karolingischen Zeit*, Kappelmacher and Schuster **262**
- Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*, Arend **357**
- Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion*, Herzog **90**
- Dionysos Eleutheros and Liber **259**
- Donatus on *Aen.* ii. 255 **254**
- drama, early Roman, philosophical aspects of **320**
- edicts concerning *publicani*: papyrus of **146 f.**; notes on readings of **148 ff.**; translation of **150**; commentary of **150 ff.**
- Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Band III, Heft 2: *Römische Geschichte*, Vogt and Kornemann **182**
- Elmore's theory of date of *Ars poetica*, discussed **163 f.**
- Eltyna, archaic inscription from **22**
- ἐπη πεποιημένα ἐς γυναῖκας (Pausanias x. 38. 11), meaning of **167**
- Epicurean groups, organization and procedure in **205**
- Epidaurische Hymnen*, Maas **171**
- escorts and retinues, use of, in Roman comedy **109 ff.**
- ethics, in early Roman drama **329 ff.**
- Excavations at Olynthus*, Part VIII: "The Terracottas of Olynthus Found in 1931," ed. Robinson **92**
- ficus Ruminalis*, Palatine, *vera historia* of **305**
- Flaminius and Philip, agreement between, discussed **342 ff.**
- Forbiger *et al.*, on *Aen.* ii. 255 **254 f.**
- fox skin, in Dionysiac cult **260**
- Friedländer's defense, of Kircher's fragment of Pindar **130 ff.**
- genti* (*Argonautica* i. 15), meaning of **55**
- "Golden Lyre," of Pindar, music of **120**
- Gortyn, perioeci of, evidence for, discussed **12 ff.**
- Greek Anthology*, poems of Archias in **225**
- Griechische Privatbriefe*, ed. Rosenberger **186**
- Haupt, on poems of Archias **226 f.**
- Herakles and Xanthias **69**
- Herodotus, attitude of, toward Alcmaeonidae **45**
- Hesperia: Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, Vol. III (1934) **278**
- Homère contre Hissarlik **289**
- Homeric language, in poems of Archias **239**
- Horace's dependence on Greek authors, in *Ars poetica* **164**
- hymns of Prudentius, discussed **71**
- I fasti dei tribuni della plebe*, Niccolini **79**
- ille*, meaning and use of **54 f.**
- immortality of soul, in Plautus **328**
- imprisonment as penalty, in ancient Athens **338**
- Index Apuleianus*, Oldfather, Canter, Perry, Abbott *et al.* **84**
- Index verborum et locutionum quae Terulliani De anima libro continentur*, Waszink **187**
- inscriptions, new Messapic **193**
- Jason, feeble, tradition of **166**
- Josephus V: Jewish Antiquities*, Books

- v-viii, trans. Thackeray and Marcus **276**
- Kaudos, perioecic status of, discussed **14 f.**
- Kircher, on music of Pindar **120**; reputation of **133 ff.**
- König Hieron der Zweite von Syrakus, Stauffenberg **181**
- Konon, on fig trees **309**
- Korfu ist nicht Ithaka, Ott **87**
- la question de Troie: Homère contre Hissarlik **289**
- La réaction païenne: Etude sur la polémique antichrétienne du I^{er} au VI^e siècle*, De Labriolle **284**
- lapis Capitolinus, discussed **72**
- Le mura di Roma repubblicana, saggio di archeologia*, Saffund **369**
- Leuce Come, 25 per cent tax at, collection of, discussed **153**
- liturgical use of Prudentius' hymns **71**
- Livy, on Romulan tree **311 f.**
- lorarius* and *lorum* **100 ff.**
- Lumb, on Anth. App. Plan. (xvi). 54. 2 **261**
- Macedonian War, Second, treaty at conclusion of **342**
- Meleager, stephanos of, discussed **229 f.**
- Menologia rustica* **353**
- Messapic inscriptions, new **193**
- Metam.* xv. 651 f., of Ovid, discussed **73 ff.**
- military regulations of Augustus **4**
- music of Pindar's "Golden Lyre" **120**
- narrative style of Caesar, development of **212**
- Nemesis, definition of **37**
- νόμος τελωνικός* (P. Oxy. 1, 36), discussed **157 ff.**
- Odysseus, bow of **168**
- official career, and administrative commissions, 218-167 B.C. **23**
- organization and procedure, in Epicurean groups **205**
- origin of Palatine fig tree **306**
- ornatus*, in writing of history **215**
- Ovid, *Metam.* xv. 651 f., discussed **73 ff.**; on tree of Romulus legend **311 f.**
- Pacuvius, Stoic influence in **322**
- pain, references to, in early Roman dramatists **326 f.**
- Palatine *figus Romularis*, renamed *Ruminalis* **312 ff.**
- pandit* versus *pandel* (*Argonautica* i. 12), discussed **58**
- Parmenion, discussed **241**
- passage of time in Plautus, devices indicating **245 ff.**
- Paternus, as source of Vegetius' *De re militari* **8**
- Pausanias, Description of Greece*, Vols. III-IV, trans. Jones; Vol. V (Illustrations and Index), ed. Wycherly **367**
- Pericles' funeral speech, propaganda in, discussed **46 f.**
- perioeci in Crete **11**
- Peripatetic doctrine, in Roman drama **330 f.**
- φιλία* and *κῆδεμονία*, in Epicurean procedure **206 f.**
- Philip, conditions of treaty of, with Rome **344**
- philosophical aspects, of early Roman drama **320**
- Phrygian provenance, of Dionysos **259**
- physics, reference to, in early playwrights of Rome **322 ff.**
- Pindar's "Golden Lyre," music of **120**
- Plato's *Laws*, imprisonment as penalty in **341**
- Plautus, continuity of time in **244**
- Plautus' use of *rex*, Greek background for **62**
- Pliny NH xiv. 12. 14, 88, and *figus Ruminalis* **306**
- Plutarch, on Romulus-Remus legend and Rumina **314 f.**
- poems of Archias **225**
- Præ-Italic Dialects of Italy*, Supplement II of **193**

prefectural edicts, concerning *publicani* 146

Priam's city, size of, discussed 292 ff.
propaganda, defined 38; evidence of, in
Thucydides and Herodotus 39 ff.

proverbial sayings, in early Roman
drama 334

Prudentius, hymns of, discussed 71
publicani, prefectural edicts concerning
146

pueri as supernumeraries, in Roman
comedy 103

Quaestiones Orphicae, Krueger 188

ratification of Roman treaties, repeti-
tion of 347

Reinach, on poems of Archias 227

Religion in Virgil, Bailey 82

retaliation, popular attitude toward
35 f.

Reviews

Arend's *Die typischen Scenen bei
Homer* (Parry) 357

Bailey's *Religion in Virgil* (Fair-
clough) 82

Butler and Barber's *Elegies of Pro-
percius* (Ullman) 169

Constans' *Cicéron, correspondance*,
Tom. I (Rand) 77

Cook, Adcock, and Charlesworth's
Cambridge Ancient History, Vol.
X, and Seltman's *Cambridge An-
cient History*, Vol. IV of Plates
(Larsen) 361

De Labriolle's *La réaction païenne*
(Green) 284

De Veau's *Bucolics of Virgil* (Reinke)
189

Drerup's *Der Humanismus* (Dor-
jahn) 360

Fairclough's trans. *Virgil*, Vol. II
(H. W. P.) 94

Fite's *Platonic Legend* (Nemiah) 88

Gigon's *Untersuchungen zu Heraklit*
(Winspear) 179

Greenwood's trans. *Cicero: "Ver-
rine Orations," Part II, Books iii,
iv, v* (De Witt) 285

Hatch's *Greek Manuscripts of the
New Testament at Mount Sinai
and at Jerusalem* (Vols. I and II)
(Colwell) 184

Hennig's *Geographie des Homerischen
Epos* (Scott) 85

Herzog's *Wunderheilungen von Epi-
dauros* (Heidel) 90

Hesperia, Vol. III (Johnson) 278

Hude's *Xenophontis commentarii*
(Dorjahn) 178

Jones's trans. *Pausanias*, Vols. III-
IV, and Wycherly's *Pausanias*,
Vol. V (Illustrations and Index)
(Johnson) 367

Kappelmacher and Schuster's *Li-
teratur der Römer bis zur karo-
linger Zeit* (Beeson) 262

Krueger's *Quaestiones Orphicae* (Stu-
key) 188

Lavell's *Biography of Greek People*
(Larsen) 272

Lengle's *Römisches Strafrecht bei
Cicero und den Historikern* (Ra-
din) 174

Lockwood's *Survey of Classical Ro-
man Literature* (Sage) 188

Lowe's *Codices Latini antiquiores*,
Part I (Ullman) 170

Lyde's *Contexts in Pindar* (Robin-
son) 267

McEwan's *Oriental Origin of Hel-
lenistic Kingship* (Nock) 371

Maas's *Epidaurische Hymnen*
(Blake) 171

Marchesi's ed. *Arnobii adversus na-
tiones libri vii* (Guinagh) 371

Moore's *Comparative Greek and Latin
Syntax* (Whatmough) 364

Mühl's *Untersuchungen zur allorien-
talischen und althellenischen Ge-
setzgebung* (Larsen) 273

Nehrbass's *Sprache und Stil der
Iamata von Epidaurios* (Heidel) 90

Niccolini's *I fasti dei tribuni della
plebe* (Hammond) 79

Oldfather, Canter, Perry, Abbott
et al., *Index Apuleianus* (Pres-
cott) 84

- Ott's *Korfu ist nicht Ithaka* (Scott) **87**
 Post's *Vatican Plato and Its Relations* (Hack) **182**
 Raby's *History of Secular Latin Poetry in Middle Ages* (Coulter) **264**
 Robinson and McGehee's *Corpus vasorum antiquorum* (Johnson) **187**
 Robinson's *Excavations at Olynthus, Part VIII* (Muller) **92**
 Robson's trans. *Arrian*, Vol. II (Oldfather) **270**
 Rosenberger's *Griechische Privatbriefe* (Keyes) **186**
 Säftund's *Le mura di Roma repubblicana* (Blake) **369**
 Skutella's ed. *S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim* (Green) **282**
 Snell's ed. *Bacchylidis Carmina* (Robinson) **268**
 Stauffenberg's *König Hieron der Zweite von Syrakus* (Larsen) **181**
 Thackeray and Marcus' trans. *Josephus V* (Coleman-Norton) **276**
 Thomson's *Art of Logos* (Haight) **274**
 Untersteiner's *Sofocle Aiace* (Gay) **280**
 Vogt and Kornemann's *Römische Geschichte* (Larsen) **182**
 Waszink's *Index verborum et locutionum quae Tertulliani De anima libro continentur* (Deferrari) **187**
 Wilson's *Ancient Textiles from Egypt in University of Michigan Collection* (Mylonas) **93**
 Wright's trans. *Select Letters of St. Jerome* (McGuire) **176**
rex in Plautus, Greek background for **62**
Römisches Strafrecht bei Cicero und den Historikern, Lengle **174**
 Roman comedy, silent rôles in **97**
 Romulus-Remus legend, and Palatine fig tree, discussed **309 ff.**
Ruminalis, as original name of Palatine *ficus* **308**
S. Aureli Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim, ed. Skutella **282**
σατράπης, in New Comedy, meaning of **66**
 Scaliger versus Politian, on *Aen.* ii. 255 **254**
 Scamander, position of, discussed **299 ff.**; sources of **301 f.**
 Schenk's view of sources of Vegetius **8**
 Schmid and Kircher, texts of Pindar's first Pythian ode of **123 ff.**
 Schoemann, on imprisonment in ancient Athens **338**
 Schrevelius' interpretation of Ovid *Metam.* xv. 651 f. **74**
Select Letters of St. Jerome, trans. Wright **176**
 Seneca's *De clementia*, passages in, discussed **348 ff.**
 Servius, on *Aen.* ii. 255 **253**; on etymology of *Ruminalis* **315**
 silent rôles in Roman comedy **97**
 slaves, parade of, in Plautus' *Pseud.* **107**
Sofocle Aiace: Introduzione e commento, ed. Untersteiner **280**
 sources, of Scamander, discussed **301 f.**; of Vegetius' *De re militari* **6**
 speeches in direct discourse, in Caesar **222 f.**
Sprache und Stil der Iamata von Epidauros: Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung, Nehrbaas **90**
 Stadtmüller, on poems of Archias **227 ff.**
 Stalitai and Setaëtai, as perioeci of Praesus **20**
 stone calendars **353 ff.**
 subordination in Caesar's style **218 f.**
 supernumeraries, in festal scenes, of Roman comedy **103 ff.**
 supernumerary rôles, in Roman comedy **98 ff.**; significance of **117 ff.**
 Tacitus *Ann.* i. 20, discussed **3**
τελώναι, discussed **150 ff.**
 terminology of witchcraft **137**
 Terminus, story of exauguration of **72**; as aniconic representation of Jupiter **72 f.**

- Terwogt, Meerum, dissertation of **53 f.**
 Thales, references to, in Roman drama **335**
The American Schools of Oriental Research: Publications of the Jerusalem School, Vol. I: *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Mount Sinai*; Vol. II: *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Jerusalem*, Hatch **184**
The Art of the Logos, Thomson **274**
The Bucolics of Vergil, ed. De Veau **189**
The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. X, eds. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth; Vol. IV of Plates, ed. Seltman **361**
The Elegies of Propertius, eds. Butler and Barber **169**
The Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship, Nock **371**
The Platonic Legend, Fite **88**
The Vatican Plato and Its Relations, Post **182**
 theology, in early Roman dramatists, **322 ff.**
 Thucydides, impartiality of **52**
tibicinae, in Roman comedy **105**
 time, continuity of, in Plautus **244**
τυωπλα, propagandic influence of **37**
 topography of Troy, discussed **294 ff.**
 tradition of feeble Jason **166**
 treaty of peace, at conclusion of Second Macedonian War **342**
triumviri agris assignandis and *coloniis deducendis*, tasks of **24**; lists of **25 ff.**; classified **29 ff.**
 Trojan army, position of, discussed **302 f.**
 Troy, capture of, discussed **253**
ρίπαυρος, translated by rex **66**
Untersuchungen zu Heraklit, Gigon **179**
Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen und althellenischen Gesetzgebung, Mühl **273**
 Valerius Flaccus, date of *Argonautica* of **53**
 Varro, and *ficus Ruminalis* **305 f.**; on *Rumina* **317 f.**
 Vegetius und das Augusteisch-Hadrianische Armeeeregiment **1**
 Virgil, Vol. II: *Aeneid vii-xii*; *The Minor Poems*, trans. Fairclough **94**
 whipping of Xanthias (Aristoph. *Frogs*), discussed **69 f.**
 witchcraft, terminology of: art **137**; witch **138**; wizard **140**; incantation **142**; verbs meaning "bewitch" **144**
 Xanthias and Herakles **69**
Xenophontis commentarii, ed. Hude **178**

The Development of Virgil's Art

By

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

Virgil the literary artist is too often forgotten in Virgil as a means of learning the Latin language. Here is a new interpretation of the great writer which indicates his position in the history of literature. Mr. Prescott applies to this classic of the ancient world the methods of modern critical appreciation.

"The book will be read with profit by teachers of Virgil, and can claim a legitimate place on the shelves of intelligent readers of literature who occasionally range into the ancient field."—*The Saturday Review of Literature*.

"He has done his task well and in an interesting manner. His book, in spite of its volume, is likely to find many a delighted reader not only among professional classicists, but also in the wider circle of those who care for the understanding of the foundations on which the great literature of Western civilization has been reared."—*New York Herald-Tribune*.

\$4.00, postpaid \$4.15

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS

The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle

By ROBERT J. BONNER AND
GERTRUDE SMITH

A contribution to Greek judicial history.

The earlier chapters are devoted to a detailed discussion of the origin and development of legal processes among the Greeks down through the age of the lawgivers. They constitute a necessary background for a history of the Athenian judiciary, which is essentially an account of the development of the Solonian Heliæa into the highly organized dicasteries of the fourth century. The Solonian Heliæa is itself the direct descendant of the Homeric *agora*, which on occasion meted out justice to public offenders.

In the chapters devoted to the Athenian system, the main theme is the machinery employed for administering justice. But matters which belong more properly to practice and procedure have not been wholly excluded.

\$4.00, postpaid \$4.15

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO PRESS

PANHELLENISM IN ARISTOPHANES

By WILLIAM MEREDITH HUGILL

Assistant Professor of Latin and Greek, University of Manitoba

Did any serious policy underlie the barbed wit and political propaganda of Aristophanes? This discussion is centered upon the *Lysistrata*, where a more positive indication of the serious views of the great comic poet of Athens is found to obtrude into the funny business of his farce. Explanation and corroboration are drawn from many passages in his other plays. This essay offers a complete examination of a document which has never before been adequately explored as a source for the political history of fifth-century Athens, and is a reasoned synopsis of Aristophanes' random but pointed utterances. Planograph, 110 pages, 8vo, cloth bound, \$1.50

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

STUDIES IN DRAMATIC "PREPARATION" IN ROMAN COMEDY

By

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

This study establishes the existence of the theory of "preparation" and demonstrates that the ancient dramatists consciously and regularly applied this theory in writing their plays. It is the first systematic study in the field.

The extant plays of Menander, Plautus, and Terence are examined and the difficult problems of contamination and Roman originality are studied in the light of evidence heretofore never thoroughly considered.

103 pages, planographed, paper-bound
\$1.00; postpaid \$1.10

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

